Freedom

Anarchist Weekly 6d

DECEMBER 6 1969 Vol 30 No 38

'HELL IS A CITY very much like London'

'A MAN WHO is tired of London is tired of life,' said Dr. Samuel Johnson; William Cobbett described it as the 'Great Wen'—or tumour; poets have said 'London is a fine town' and unflattering comparisons with hell have been made by others.

The conclusion is rapidly being reached that London itself is tired of, or at least hostile to life; there are signs that the tumour is taking over the body and the hell of noise, speed and dirt is increasingly the lot of the Londoner.

Now the Greater London Council has come up with a plan (yes, another!) to reshape London, and the final blow is a suggestion to pay for all these amenities of new motorways, new suburban centres, with a sales tax imposed on all goods bought in London. This is following the precedent of New York and other towns who have tried to solve their difficulties by this means—and it didn't work!

Basically this tax is supposed to raise revenue but like parking meters and betting taxes (to name only two examples) it is also aimed to discourage the practice which is taxed. It is hoped by this means to keep down the number of people shopping in London and solve some of the problems of traffic, in the same way that it was hoped by taxes to keep down gambling and the parking of cars—it didn't, of course, and the economy became more and more dependent upon the taxes raised by parking meters, by gambling, by alcohol, purchase tax, SET, etc., thus making us all utterly dependent upon that which some of us would seek to see limited.

Additionally this device makes it increasingly important to get money. London has for years been a 'fine town' if you had money. The glories of Carnaby Street and the King's Road are open to all—'like the Ritz Hotel'. The comfortably-off will still be able to shop—and park their other car—in London.

It has also been noticed, particularly natively, the old arrangements may yet suffice if the new mobility is surrendered, or at least drastically restrained. It is certain there has never been a choice so significant to the future of our towns.' This book was written in 1958 and apart from setting up a research unit by the Ministry of Transport with Colin Buchanan as its head, the traffic situation has grown worse.

One hesitates, as one accepts lifts from car-owning friends, to affirm that the private car in London is an unmitigated curse but evidence accumulates that this is so. An unusually frank motorist correspondent in the *Guardian* said, 'The ownership and use of a motor car is for the majority of us a selfish private convenience and a public nuisance.'

The consequence of the acceptance of the private motor car entails the construction of new motorways. The latest instalment of the South Circular Motorway (Ringway 2) is estimated to cost £250 million and, what is more important, will cost the destruction of 3,000 houses. Another expert, Michael Thomson and his group have produced a book *Motorways in London* which, if anybody takes any notice of it, and unless the group retire into the awful silence of a Ministry, should give thought to those who think 'concrete spaghetti' is the answer to the problem.

They write: 'We have examined the motorway proposals and have concluded that the motorways would generate a volume of traffic from 70 to 100% greater than would otherwise materialise. The existing roads would in general be more congested than they are today, and the levels of traffic in most residential and shopping streets would be greatly increased; there would be widespread deterioration in the environment, higher fares and falling quality of service on the buses and the Underground and a serious rise in road accidents. Except for the

OPEN LETTER TO THE H

LISTEN MR. CAL

DEAR MR. CALLAGHAN,

Homilies on principles, even if trite, simple and short, fall most oddly from the lips of members of the present Labour Government.

You were personally credited, a short time ago, with having ambitions to usurp Mr. Wilson's position as Prime Minister. Whether the rumours were true or not, we on the sidelines of the game you play have no means of knowing, but we can all see that you are still there, growing in smugness if not in stature, as you wallow in the power apparently invested in your position of Home Secretary.

If they were true, and you really disapproved of the way Mr. Wilson was running the Government, there were two choices open to you: you could have openly challenged his leadership with a direct confrontation or you could have resigned. You did neither.

We can understand you funking the first. Mr. Wilson has too many Aces up his sleeve and having got rid of the Joker he is not likely to be beaten by a Knave. But since you have chosen to talk about principles—why did you not follow the second course, and resign? Do you think you are too valuable a chap to be wasted on the back benches—even though everybody knows that if Parliament contains *any* principled men, that's where they are? Or was your job too attractive to give up just because of some disagreement with your leader?

FAITHFUL PARTY-LINER?

Or are you after all *not* in disagreement with your leader? Are you at one with him on all his policies? We must assume you are, since as member of the Inner Cabinet you must accept corporate responsibility for Government decisions. You therefore toe the party line faithfully on, for example, Biafra, Vietnam, the Bomb, Labour Relations and the deliberate creation of a pool of unemployed, the Wage Freeze and many other issues. Including the cut-back in building for homes, but not for prisons.

Ah, now we enter your special preserve. You, as Home Secretary, are in charge of Her Majesty's Prison Service as well as having over-all say (on paper at least) for the police forces of Britain—and Northern Ireland. Perhaps it was because you are so proud of the brave new plans for building new prisons (a sort of Soviet-type Five-Year Plan, is it not?) and because you know as much as anyone about the special purposes police forces that have been created fairly recently (complete with riot shields and, we have no doubt, ample supplies of CS gas), that you stayed in the Government in spite of its recent attempts to make strikes illegal.

After all, the job of a Government is to govern, as every Labour Prime Minister has repeatedly told his more socialistic followers, and as you are obviously an enthusiastic law-and-order supporter, and no fool, you clearly realise that if a Government is to introduce totalitarian-type anti-labour legislation, it must have the necessary force to beat down the inevitable opposition.

For the excuse to build up these forces in advance of their need, you must admit that you have to thank the Protesters and the Demonstrators. Through all the years

The conclusion is rapidly being reached that London itself is tired of, or at least hostile to life; there are signs that the tumour is taking over the body and the hell of noise, speed and dirt is increasingly the lot of the Londoner.

Now the Greater London Council has come up with a plan (yes, another!) to reshape London, and the final blow is a suggestion to pay for all these amenities of new motorways, new suburban centres, with a sales tax imposed on all goods bought in London. This is following the precedent of New York and other towns who have tried to solve their difficulties by this means—and it didn't work!

Basically this tax is supposed to raise revenue but like parking meters and betting taxes (to name only two examples) it is also aimed to discourage the practice which is taxed. It is hoped by this means to keep down the number of people shopping in London and solve some of the problems of traffic, in the same way that it was hoped by taxes to keep down gambling and the parking of cars—it didn't, of course, and the economy became more and more dependent upon the taxes raised by parking meters, by gambling, by alcohol, purchase tax, SET, etc., thus making us all utterly dependent upon that which some of us would seek to see limited.

Additionally this device makes it increasingly important to get money. London has for years been a 'fine town' if you had money. The glories of Carnaby Street and the King's Road are open to all—'like the Ritz Hotel'. The comfortably-off will still be able to shop—and park their other car—in London.

It has also been noticed, particularly in Fulham, the tendency to eliminate 'working-class communities from the smart parts of London'. There has been, for years, a pattern of bohemians (with aesthetic appreciation but no money) to move into suburbs which have charm and character (e.g. parts of Fulham, Highbury and the tatty bits of St. John's Wood) then the smart operators move in and develop the area for town houses on which the *nouveau riche* can get a grant. The working-class inhabitants are gently —or not so gently, off-loaded to—who knows or cares where? To some Sophiastown promoted by the GLC. In Fulham an entire new housing scheme was sabotaged and sunk with the co-operation of the Tory Council and the Labour Government. Now the Moore Park Road area is a Tom Tiddler's ground for speculators and the only Council-sponsored development taking place is the construction of garages for the new residents.

This brings us to the secondary cause of the strangulation of London. The motor car. To some of us the motor car is a mixed blessing. Colin Buchanan in his book of that title writes:

'Now, suddenly as it were, a startling new habit has developed. A single invention, in the course of a few years' development, has placed within the grasp of every man and woman a means of rapid *personal* movement ten to twenty times faster than walking. Suddenly, at a stroke, the familiar arrangements of buildings, streets, and footways, that have endured so long as to seem unchangeable, are jerked out of date as people race and jostle in the streets in their new-found mobility. It is not a matter of building a few new roads. It is a matter of dealing with a new social situation. New urban arrangements are needed if the killing and wounding, the noise and the stink and confusion, are to be avoided. Alter-

Ministry of Transport with Colin Buchanan as its head, the traffic situation has grown worse.

One hesitates, as one accepts lifts from car-owning friends, to affirm that the private car in London is an unmitigated curse but evidence accumulates that this is so. An unusually frank motorist correspondent in the *Guardian* said, 'The ownership and use of a motor car is for the majority of us a selfish private convenience and a public nuisance.'

The consequence of the acceptance of the private motor car entails the construction of new motorways. The latest instalment of the South Circular Motorway (Ringway 2) is estimated to cost £250 million and, what is more important, will cost the destruction of 3,000 houses. Another expert, Michael Thomson and his group have produced a book *Motorways in London* which, if anybody takes any notice of it, and unless the group retire into the awful silence of a Ministry, should give thought to those who think 'concrete spaghetti' is the answer to the problem.

They write: 'We have examined the motorway proposals and have concluded that the motorways would generate a volume of traffic from 70 to 100% greater than would otherwise materialise. The existing roads would in general be more congested than they are today, and the levels of traffic in most residential and shopping streets would be greatly increased; there would be widespread deterioration in the environment, higher fares and falling quality of service on the buses and the Underground and a serious rise in road accidents. Except for the minority of long distance traffic the motorways would not, we believe, lead to large savings in overall journey times for motorists. . . . The motorways would do little to alleviate traffic congestion in central London and in the main suburban centres or to ease peak-hour travel problems for the majority of people.'

The motor and its accomplice, the motorway, are murdering the architecture of London and indeed the whole world landscape; for the problem of the hell that is cities is not only that of London but of New York, Tokyo, Berlin, Paris or wherever the great city stands.

All this will of course be labelled 'Luddism' by those opponents of anarchism regardless of the fact that not one of the criticisms quoted above have come from anarchist or neo-anarchist sources.

It is not necessary to be a Luddite as far as the mechanics of London are concerned. The system itself provides its own built-in Luddism. The wildest anarchist terrorist working overtime could

Continued on page 4

Joker he is not likely to be beaten by a Knave. But since you have chosen to talk about principles—why did you not follow the second course, and resign? Do you think you are too valuable a chap to be wasted on the back benches—even though everybody knows that if Parliament contains *any* principled men, that's where they are? Or was your job too attractive to give up just because of some disagreement with your leader?

FAITHFUL PARTY-LINER?

Or are you after all *not* in disagreement with your leader? Are you at one with him on all his policies? We must assume you are, since as member of the Inner Cabinet you must accept corporate responsibility for Government decisions. You therefore toe the party line faithfully on, for example, Biafra, Vietnam, the Bomb, Labour Relations and the deliberate creation of a pool of unemployed, the Wage Freeze and many other issues. Including the cut-back in building for homes, but not for prisons.

Ah, now we enter your special preserve. You, as Home Secretary, are in charge of Her Majesty's Prison Service as well as having over-all say (on paper at least) for the police forces of Britain—and Northern Ireland. Perhaps it was because you are so proud of the brave new plans for building new prisons (a sort of Soviet-type Five-Year Plan, is it not?) and because you know as much as anyone about the special purposes police forces that have been created fairly recently (complete with riot shields and, we have no doubt, ample supplies of CS gas), that you stayed in the Government in spite of its recent attempts to make strikes illegal.

After all, the job of a Government is to govern, as every Labour Prime Minister has repeatedly told his more socialistic followers, and as you are obviously an enthusiastic law-and-order supporter, and no fool, you clearly realise that if a Government is to introduce totalitarian-type anti-labour legislation, it must have the necessary force to beat down the inevitable opposition.

For the excuse to build up these forces in advance of their need, you must admit that you have to thank the Protesters and the Demonstrators. Through all the years of apathy and no-protest, even through the years of pacifist sit-downs and non-violent protest, your old traditional British Bobby was adequate—even an asset. But when contempt for your kind of policies turned to anger and anger turned to violence, then you had the reason for following your colleagues in totalitarian states. You must have watched the news-reels of the May-Days in France last year, noting the equipment and behaviour of the CRS, from a totally different standpoint from those of your fellow-countrymen with liberal or socialistic—let alone anarchistic—points of view. We imagine you sitting nodding wih approval as law-and-order was re-asserted, and no doubt you hurried up the plans for the British version of the CRS, since used in Northern Ireland.

THE WIDER PROBLEM

In France, of course, the law-and-order problem was much wider than you have so far had to deal with here. It spread from students to workers, and like any one-time socialist (or do we presume too much?) you know that any real threat to a regime must include the working people in very large numbers. Ironically enough, it is you and your colleagues in the Cabinet who have managed to alienate more working people than any other British Government since 1926.

Those of us who have, you might say, a special interest

Brighton Squat Broken

SIX OF BRIGHTON'S nine squatting families were rehoused in substandard Welfare accommodation two days before the formal eviction order came into effect. The remaining three were evicted onto the streets. They went to the Reception Centre but were refused accommodation on the grounds that they were not Brighton residents. They come from Hove. Hove has no reception centre and the Welfare Department of Hove refused to help in any way. So the families have been accommodated at the University for at least the weekend.

The accommodation that the six families went to is substandard in the extreme, and does not come anywhere near to the standard of the ten council houses we squatted in, or the Ministry of Defence houses. But, nonetheless, a good question to ask is where did these Welfare houses appear fr denials that they ha empty.

The police have be their attempts to get th on conspiracy charge timidated the families ments against the sq timidated various secti making statements ag and ended up after th intimidation with the the most complicate Brighton since 1942. from the Director of was that they had w

OPEN LETTER TO THE HOME SECRETARY

LISTEN MR. CALLAGHAN!

DEAR MR. CALLAGHAN,

Homilies on principles, even if trite, simple and short, fall most oddly from the lips of members of the present Labour Government.

You were personally credited, a short time ago, with having ambitions to usurp Mr. Wilson's position as Prime Minister. Whether the rumours were true or not, we on the sidelines of the game you play have no means of knowing, but we can all see that you are still there, growing in smugness if not in stature, as you wallow in the power apparently invested in your position of Home Secretary.

If they were true, and you really disapproved of the way Mr. Wilson was running the Government, there were two choices open to you: you could have openly challenged his leadership with a direct confrontation or you could have resigned. You did neither.

We can understand you funking the first. Mr. Wilson has too many Aces up his sleeve and having got rid of the Joker he is not likely to be beaten by a Knave. But since you have chosen to talk about principles—why did you not follow the second course, and resign? Do you think you are too valuable a chap to be wasted on the back benches—even though everybody knows that if Parliament contains *any* principled men, that's where they are? Or was your job too attractive to give up just because of some disagreement with your leader?

FAITHFUL PARTY-LINER?

Or are you after all *not* in disagreement with your leader? Are you at one with him on all his policies? We must assume you are, since as member of the Inner Cabinet you must accept corporate responsibility for Government decisions. You therefore toe the party line faithfully on, for example, Biafra, Vietnam, the Bomb, Labour Relations and the deliberate creation of a pool of unemployed, the Wage Freeze and many other issues. Including the cut-back in building for homes, but not for prisons.

Ah, now we enter your special preserve. You, as Home Secretary, are in charge of Her Majesty's Prison Service as well as having over-all say (on paper at least) for the police forces of Britain—and Northern Ireland. Perhaps it was because you are so proud of the brave new plans for building new prisons (a sort of Soviet-type Five-Year Plan, is it not?) and because you know as much as anyone about the special purposes police forces that have been created fairly recently (complete with riot shields and, we have no doubt, ample supplies of CS gas), that you stayed in the Government in spite of its recent attempts to make strikes illegal.

After all, the job of a Government is to govern, as every Labour Prime Minister has repeatedly told his more socialistic followers, and as you are obviously an enthusiastic law-and-order supporter, and no fool, you clearly realise that if a Government is to introduce totalitarian-type anti-labour legislation, it must have the necessary force to beat down the inevitable opposition.

For the excuse to build up these forces in advance of their need, you must admit that you have to thank the Protesters and the Demonstrators. Through all the years in remembering such things, cannot remember a period in which such a wide range of workers have felt constrained to demonstrate and go on strike. Not only, predictably, dockers and railwaymen and builders, but bank clerks and teachers and nurses, have actually walked the streets with placards and taken direct action against their own exploitation!

Oddly enough, you reserve your wrath for those who protest against *other's* exploitation. Perhaps it isn't so odd, though. The professional, middle-class worker was only just getting his feet wet. He behaved with decorum and with what you must have thought was admirable restraint. Those who protest for wider issues—Vietnam, Biafra, South Africa—are hard cases in comparison, and you are right to be more concerned about containing them. They are out to destroy what you stand for; the bank clerks will shut up for a mere 7 per cent.

JUST TO CAUSE TROUBLE?

All the same, you shouldn't be a liar, you know. You can afford to give credit where credit is due, and if you lie, we are forced to believe that you are afraid of the truth. We have to admit that you have the power; at least you could admit that we have the principles.

But no, you even want to take that away from us. When you came to the television cameras after your conference with your police chiefs last week, you grudgingly admitted that 'many' of the anti-Springbok demonstrators were motivated by principles, *but*, there were, of course 'the usual job lot of anarchists and renta-crowd hangers-on', who go around just to cause trouble.

Inasmuch as your smugness can slip, it slipped then, and so did your image of friendly, honest Jim. You revealed the typical spitefulness of the power-seeking Labour politician reminded of what his party used to stand for.

Now you listen here, politician. It is not for you and your hypocritical kind to criticise the anarchists on grounds of principle, and if we tend to turn up everywhere, it is because we are against everything that you and your kind stand for—on principle.

You and your kind, politician. When we protest against Vietnam it is because your kind in America and Saigon and Hanoi are behaving normally. When we protest about Czechoslovakia it is because your kind in the Kremlin are running true to form. It is because your kind in Pretoria bring politics into sport that we protest against the Springboks—and if anarchists are among your 'trouble-makers' it is because anarchists want to stop the game, they don't just want to make a symbolic protest outside the stadium.

LOCAL INITIATIVES

But get one thing straight, politician. It is not the same 'job lot' of anarchists going around causing trouble. It used to be, but not any more. Thanks to you and your kind behaving normally around the world, there are more anarchist today than ever before. There may be a very few individuals with the time and the determination enough to go where they feel they are needed, but since most of us are working people with limited means we are not as free as perhaps we would like to be to go around

Joker he is not likely to be beaten by a Knave. But since you have chosen to talk about principles—why did you not follow the second course, and resign? Do you think you are too valuable a chap to be wasted on the back benches—even though everybody knows that if Parliament contains *any* principled men, that's where they are? Or was your job too attractive to give up just because of some disagreement with your leader?

FAITHFUL PARTY-LINER?

Or are you after all *not* in disagreement with your leader? Are you at one with him on all his policies? We must assume you are, since as member of the Inner Cabinet you must accept corporate responsibility for Government decisions. You therefore toe the party line faithfully on, for example, Biafra, Vietnam, the Bomb, Labour Relations and the deliberate creation of a pool of unemployed, the Wage Freeze and many other issues. Including the cut-back in building for homes, but not for prisons.

Ah, now we enter your special preserve. You, as Home Secretary, are in charge of Her Majesty's Prison Service as well as having over-all say (on paper at least) for the police forces of Britain—and Northern Ireland. Perhaps it was because you are so proud of the brave new plans for building new prisons (a sort of Soviet-type Five-Year Plan, is it not?) and because you know as much as anyone about the special purposes police forces that have been created fairly recently (complete with riot shields and, we have no doubt, ample supplies of CS gas), that you stayed in the Government in spite of its recent attempts to make strikes illegal.

After all, the job of a Government is to govern, as every Labour Prime Minister has repeatedly told his more socialistic followers, and as you are obviously an enthusiastic law-and-order supporter, and no fool, you clearly realise that if a Government is to introduce totalitarian-type anti-labour legislation, it must have the necessary force to beat down the inevitable opposition.

For the excuse to build up these forces in advance of their need, you must admit that you have to thank the Protesters and the Demonstrators. Through all the years of apathy and no-protest, even through the years of pacifist sit-downs and non-violent protest, your old traditional British Bobby was adequate—even an asset. But when contempt for your kind of policies turned to anger and anger turned to violence, then you had the reason for following your colleagues in totalitarian states. You must have watched the news-reels of the May-Days in France last year, noting the equipment and behaviour of the CRS, from a totally different standpoint from those of your fellow-countrymen with liberal or socialistic—let alone anarchistic—points of view. We imagine you sitting nodding wih approval as law-and-order was re-asserted, and no doubt you hurried up the plans for the British version of the CRS, since used in Northern Ireland.

THE WIDER PROBLEM

In France, of course, the law-and-order problem was much wider than you have so far had to deal with here. It spread from students to workers, and like any one-time socialist (or do we presume too much?) you know that any real threat to a regime must include the working people in very large numbers. Ironically enough, it is you and your colleagues in the Cabinet who have managed to alienate more working people than any other British Government since 1926.

Those of us who have, you might say, a special interest

All the same, you shouldn't be a liar, you know. You can afford to give credit where credit is due, and if you lie, we are forced to believe that you are afraid of the truth. We have to admit that you have the power; at least you could admit that we have the principles.

But no, you even want to take that away from us. When you came to the television cameras after your conference with your police chiefs last week, you grudgingly admitted that 'many' of the anti-Springbok demonstrators were motivated by principles, *but*, there were, of course 'the usual job lot of anarchists and renta-crowd hangers-on', who go around just to cause trouble.

Inasmuch as your smugness can slip, it slipped then, and so did your image of friendly, honest Jim. You revealed the typical spitefulness of the power-seeking Labour politician reminded of what his party used to stand for.

Now you listen here, politician. It is not for you and your hypocritical kind to criticise the anarchists on grounds of principle, and if we tend to turn up everywhere, it is because we are against everything that you and your kind stand for—on principle.

You and your kind, politician. When we protest against Vietnam it is because your kind in America and Saigon and Hanoi are behaving normally. When we protest about Czechoslovakia it is because your kind in the Kremlin are running true to form. It is because your kind in Pretoria bring politics into sport that we protest against the Springboks—and if anarchists are among your 'trouble-makers' it is because anarchists want to stop the game, they don't just want to make a symbolic protest outside the stadium.

LOCAL INITIATIVES

But get one thing straight, politician. It is not the same 'job lot' of anarchists going around causing trouble. It used to be, but not any more. Thanks to you and your kind behaving normally around the world, there are more anarchist today than ever before. There may be a very few individuals with the time and the determination enough to go where they feel they are needed, but since most of us are working people with limited means we are not as free as perhaps we would like to be to go around causing trouble for you and your kind. After all, you cause enough for us!

But we don't have to. When there is a demonstration in Swansea, South Wales anarchists take the initiative; in Aberdeen, Southampton, London or Liverpool, local anarchists are there. Just be thankful, politician, that we cannot yet call up huge numbers. When we can, we shall stop your political games wherever we can—and we don't mean only rugger!

One final point. Anarchists fight racialism not only because it is an insult to our intelligence, our humanity and our internationalism, but also because it is a particularly vile instrument of government. We don't expect social democrats to go along with that, but even if they lived up to their own supposed principles, there would not be the need for anarchists to be 'the conscience of the Left', as we have been described. Neither would there be the need for pitiful laws to contain racialism. Anarchists do not need the Race Relations Act—but if it had been invoked against a team quite openly chosen on racialist grounds, then we should not need to be 'making trouble' on Saturday afternoons, either!

If you don't do your job, Mr. Callaghan, we've got to do ours!

Yours very sincerely,

JUSTIN.

Brighton Squat Broken

extreme, and does not come anywhere near to the standard of the ten council houses we squatted in, or the Ministry of Defence houses. But, nonetheless, a good question to ask is where did these Welfare houses appear from after repeated denials that they had any that were empty.

The police have been very active in their attempts to get the 'squatter helpers' on conspiracy charges; they have intimidated the families into making statements against the squatter helpers, intimidated various sections of helpers into making statements against other helpers, and ended up after three weeks of hard intimidation with the prospect of having the most complicated legal case in Brighton since 1942. But, alas, the reply from the Director of Public Prosecutions was that they had wasted enough time and money and they did not want to waste any more, all the statements made being contradictory anyway.

YOSSARIAN.

LATEST DATE FOR RECEIPT OF MSS., LETTERS, MEETING NOTICES IS THE MONDAY IN EACH WEEK OF PUBLICATION.

WE GO TO PRESS ON MONDAY

Language of Anarchism

NOAM CHOMSKY is Professor of Linguistics at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and one of the world's leading scholars in his field, having made an international reputation with such books as *Syntactic structures, Aspects of the theory of syntax, Cartesian linguistics,* et al. There is also, however, another side to the man very well illustrated by the collection of essays just published by Penguin and called *American power and the new mandarins* (8/-).* This is what I call a 'publisher's book' consisting of a ragbag of old essays, lectures and articles written for *Ramparts, The New York Review of Books,* etc. and at 8/- it is disgracefully overpriced. But having said this I must admit my adverse criticism of the book ends, and once again anarchists can be grateful to the Penguin Press for putting another fine book on the market.

I ought to confess at the beginning that I am simply not competent to give this book the review it deserves, and this is the more to be regretted since Raymond Williams produced a travesty of a review for the *Guardian* which, although intended to be favourable, made it quite clear that he hadn't even read the book, and was therefore hardly an inducement to rush out and buy it—which is, in fact, just what you ought to do!* Now although, as I admitted, I am just not qualified to challenge Chomsky's scholarship, I have at least read the book from cover to cover, so let me commit a reviewer's heresy and tell you exactly some of the things that are in it.

Although the book is supposed to be about American attitudes to Vietnam, the most important connecting link between the various essays is Chomsky's angry exposure of a deep-rooted and fundamental misconception which has become so widespread over the USA during the last 3 or 4 decades as to completely corrupt so-called 'objective, liberal scholarship'. He doesn't waste his ammunition on those lunatics who call for the annihilation of China and Vietnam with nuclear weapons, but reserves his fire for those 'responsible' men, 'experts' and advisers, to whom the nation listens with a fair amount of respect, but who time after time reveal through their various, much-publicized suggestions and pronouncements that never, not for a single moment, *do they question America's absolute right to use her unequal power whenever and wherever she likes*! All for splendidly altruistic and noble reasons, of course!

Does this have a familiar ring to it? It certainly ought to, for Chomsky shows, with painstaking scholarship, how leading American spokesmen—particularly professors, economists and social scientists — are repeatedly expressing themselves in the old traditional rhetoric of imperialism. It's all been said before in exactly the same way by the British, the French, the Japanese and the Germans. One hears so much about 'Yankee imperialism' that I for one regard the phrase with suspicion—a slogan used as an excuse for honest criticism—but Chomsky reveals with startling clarity and inexorable logic the fantastic extent to which the American intelligentsia of the *Centre-Left*, not the Right, have swallowed the whole rotten imperialist idea.

The acceptance of this imperialistic basis has tainted the fruits of American scholarship in many fields. To prove his point, Chomsky launches into a powerful critique of the histories of the Spanish Civil War—an astonishing tour de force for one whose field is linguistics, as he reveals a thorough knowledge of anarchist sources in 3 or 4 languages as well as having explored most of the better-known works on the subject. In fact, whether Chomsky calls himself an anarchist or not this essay is certainly sufficient to qualify him as one of the foremost anarchist historians of today—at least in the English-speaking countries. Anyone who has a specialized interest in Spain will find this essay (with 25 pages of detailed notes) an indispensable text.

This leads us to the question, Is Chomsky an anarchist? Possibly not, but in his introduction there is absolutely no ambiguity in *this* statement:

'To me it seems that the revival of anarchist thinking in the "New Left" and the attempts to put it into effect are the most promising development of the past years, and that if this development can solidify it offers some hope that the present American crisis will not become an American and world catastrophe.'

Chomsky's adversaries would probaly dismiss this remark as the attempt of a drowning man to clutch at straws, but to an anarchist it offers clear proof that Chomsky is not only acquainted with the negative side gone further and positive nature for social and p

Rather than p the man, though book speak for i certain similarity that neither Or what is now cal liars. Orwell on terrible lesson Spanish Civil W truth seemed to b cept. Himself an he would have deceit, fulminate strove to write as as he could. Ch path, stressing honesty, compass restraint. He wi with arguments b again and again that Americans themselves 'How 'Have we the rig plicit assumption right to . . . ' than superior st deeply rooted in whelming majori cians and their Chomsky a cle USA is following 'the fascist aggr ago'.

Although I ha

THE GREAT TERROR

THE PRESENT-DAY Russian tyrants, the 'Social-Democratic Bolsheviks', are surrounded by a thick and high blood-stained wall around the Kremlin, from which they domineer over the Russian people.

Physically they are well protected, but spiritually they are persecuted and can find no restful sleep. This atmosphere of disquiet, of unease, has been hovering there ever since the days of Ivan Groznoy, Ivan the Terrible, up to the era of the blood-soaked, mentally diseased tyrant Stalin; and this spirit of restlessness still pervades that area, in a somewhat changed form, to this very day.

The contemporary tyrants are physically armed with atomic and hydrogen bombs, with a huge and mighty army, with a fleet that sails over the seven seas. They have fulfilled the dream of Catherine the Great, having become the world's second mightiest power. Shielded by such stupendous physical power the Russian despots ought to be able to sleep peacefully behind the Kremlin walls . . . but such tranquillity is denied them; for in that great, spiritually potent land of Russia there have appeared the first signs that the innocent blood that was shed by the martyrs is not silent. From

note that Prof. Konev, who discusses the Russian Anarchist movement, did not deem it necessary to mention the two foremost Anarchist figures—Bakunin and Kropotkin—as if they had never existed. It is obvious that this learned professor was intent to conceal from the masses of Russian youth the names of these two world-renowned Anarchists.

What Prof. Konev does endeavour to do in this article is to convince the readers that the Anarchists were highly dangerous characters; he alleges, for example, that the entire Russian Anarchist movement consisted of criminals who engaged exclusively in murder and robbery. He contends that the Anarchists went to the extreme of printing counterfeit currency; that they all went around armed with bombs and revolvers, and thus constituted a great peril to society, and it was for that reason that the 'Soviet Regime decided to deport all Anarchists to Siberia'. Apparently the professor's masters made their hireling conveniently forget about the millions of victims put to death by his government.

The professor from Moscow, Zastenker, analyzes in his article the European Anarchist movement, and devotes special attention to the philosophy of Prud-

It is encouraging to know that in enslaved Russia sparks of a new life have manifested themselves. Indeed, several days ago I made the acquaintance of a man who maintains some connections with Soviet Russia and he confirmed that in the Soviet Union an underground Anarchist movement exists. However, the two articles in question by the abovementioned professors likewise suffice to lead one to believe than an Anarchist movement presently exists in Russia.

BERL KAVKAZER.

OPEN FORUM

TOWARDS AN ANARCHIST MANIFESTO

FUNDAMENTALS

NO INDIVIDUAL, or group of individuals, has the right to dominate any other individual or group. This simple belief is at the root of my anarchist philosophy. We thus immediately reject all types of government, all forms of exploitation at work (whether under capitalism or state-capitalism), all imperialism and colonialism, and incidentally all hierarchical organisations.

A revolutionary needs an analysis of present society, a vision of the ideal

THE NO ANARC

THE YORKSH Anarchist F on Saturday 29th Conference. The cussion was the ference on 'Where We Sta AFB. Complain NWAF comrades festo nor the con any publicity by many disagreed letter has been s port of the comp

The discussion be held at the U chester, on Dece divided into two and its implicati the conference. wide differences the NWAF and

On the subject its implications, rades expressed agreement with manifesto was in that it gave the the AFB into The suggestion th

most important connecting link between the various essays is Chomsky's angry exposure of a deep-rooted and funda-

to which the American intelligentsia of the *Centre-Left*, not the Right, have swallowed the whole rotten imperialist

drowning man to clutch at straws, but to an anarchist it offers clear proof that Chomsky is not only acquainted with

'the fascist aggr
ago'.
Although I ha

THE GREAT TERROR

THE PRESENT-DAY Russian tyrants, the 'Social-Democratic Bolsheviks', are surrounded by a thick and high blood-stained wall around the Kremlin, from which they domineer over the Russian people.

Physically they are well protected, but spiritually they are persecuted and can find no restful sleep. This atmosphere of disquiet, of unease, has been hovering there ever since the days of Ivan Groznoy, Ivan the Terrible, up to the era of the blood-soaked, mentally diseased tyrant Stalin; and this spirit of restlessness still pervades that area, in a somewhat changed form, to this very day.

The contemporary tyrants are physically armed with atomic and hydrogen bombs, with a huge and mighty army, with a fleet that sails over the seven seas. They have fulfilled the dream of Catherine the Great, having become the world's second mightiest power. Shielded by such stupendous physical power the Russian despots ought to be able to sleep peacefully behind the Kremlin walls . . . but such tranquillity is denied them; for in that great, spiritually potent land of Russia there have appeared the first signs that the innocent blood that was shed by the martyrs is not silent. From their blood there have begun to sprout the first blooms of revolt and protest. This upsurge reminds the tyrants of the words echoed in the revolutionary song: 'Your fate is written upon the wall'. Indeed, upon the very walls of the Kremlin they can read the story of the dire fate that befell all previous tyrants.

For the time being we do not know quite clearly as yet precisely what has happened there. But one thing is sure: the tyrants felt obliged to attack the Anarchist movement in Russia and in the rest of Europe.

In order to try to convince the Russian people, the Bolsheviks gave this assignment to two scholars, professors: one from Moscow, the other from Leningrad.

In September of 1968, in the journal entitled *Voprosi Istoriy* (Historical Problems), which is a subsidiary of the daily newspaper *Pravda,* there appeared two 'scientific' articles. It is intriguing to note that Prof. Konev, who discusses the Russian Anarchist movement, did not deem it necessary to mention the two foremost Anarchist figures—Bakunin and Kropotkin—as if they had never existed. It is obvious that this learned professor was intent to conceal from the masses of Russian youth the names of these two world-renowned Anarchists.

What Prof. Konev does endeavour to do in this article is to convince the readers that the Anarchists were highly dangerous characters; he alleges, for example, that the entire Russian Anarchist movement consisted of criminals who engaged exclusively in murder and robbery. He contends that the Anarchists went to the extreme of printing counterfeit currency; that they all went around armed with bombs and revolvers, and thus constituted a great peril to society, and it was for that reason that the 'Soviet Regime decided to deport all Anarchists to Siberia'. Apparently the professor's masters made their hireling conveniently forget about the millions of victims put to death by his government.

The professor from Moscow, Zastenker, analyzes in his article the European Anarchist movement, and devotes special attention to the philosophy of Prudhomme. The selfsame professor furthermore makes the utterly absurd statement that Mussolini, and all fascists and monarchists, are adherents of this French thinker. It is of such nonsense that virtually the entire essay by Prof. Zastenker consists.

It is to such idiotic devices that the Bolsheviks have resorted to combat the Anarchist ideal, impelled by an overpowering sense of fear. But the Anarchist ideal sank deep roots during the period of the great Russian Social Revolution. Small in numbers as the Anarchist movement may now be in Russia, it is still a gratifying fact that the liberty-loving ideal still lives there. And despite the melancholy realization that new victims must be expected, and new sacrifices, still one derives comfort from the knowledge that in Russia one still finds elements in the population who dare to protest against the ruthless tyrants.

It is encouraging to know that in enslaved Russia sparks of a new life have manifested themselves. Indeed, several days ago I made the acquaintance of a man who maintains some connections with Soviet Russia and he confirmed that in the Soviet Union an underground Anarchist movement exists. However, the two articles in question by the abovementioned professors likewise suffice to lead one to believe than an Anarchist movement presently exists in Russia.

BERL KAVKAZER.

OPEN FORUM

TOWARDS AN ANARCHIST MANIFESTO

FUNDAMENTALS

NO INDIVIDUAL, or group of individuals, has the right to dominate any other individual or group. This simple belief is at the root of my anarchist philosophy. We thus immediately reject all types of government, all forms of exploitation at work (whether under capitalism or state-capitalism), all imperialism and colonialism, and incidentally all hierarchical organisations.

A revolutionary needs an analysis of present society, a vision of the ideal society, and some idea of how to turn one into the other. The first is easy to acquire: the country is run by a power élite (estimated at up to 5,000) ranging from cabinet ministers and top civil servants to bankers and army chiefs. These are the people who make the decisions which affect our lives; whether they are aware of their collective power is irrelevant. The formal machinery of 'democracy' (Parliament) is merely a method by which minor pressure groups (the political parties) impinge on the Government. The élite's power stems from its control of the economy, education, and public opinion, and ultimately by its control of the police and the armed forces.

As for our vision of Utopia, we can at least imagine parts of it: factories run by the workers, an absence of coercion and money, social services run by voluntary associations. But how can we transform society in the way we wish? It is easy enough to pick out individual evils, and to oppose them. But to change the very structure of society requires, by definition, a revolution. It is the nature and methods of the revolutionary organisation which cause most arguments on the 'Left'.

METHODS

Bakunin once said: 'One cannot bring about a libertarian society by means of an authoritarian organisation.' I would add that one is unlikely to bring about a society based on peace and brotherhood by means of a violent organisation, and would remind comrades of Michels' 'Iron Law': that **all** organisations tend to oligarchy.

Revolutionaries have two main tasks: to convince people that fundamental change is necessary and desirable, and to show that it is possible. The development of 'consciousness' is important—

Anarchist Federation of Britain

The **AFB** information office will produce an internal bulletin. Comrades interested in its production are to meet in Birmingham on the first weekend of each month, from November onwards. All groups will be informed in detail. Address all letters to:

Peter Le Mare, 5 Hannafore Road, Rotton Park, Birmingham, 16. Material that cannot wait for the bulletin to be sent to **R. Atkins,** Vanbrugh College, Heslington, York.

The Contact Column in 'Freedom' is also available for urgent information.

Groups should send latest addresses to Birmingham. New inquirers should write direct to them or to the AFB information office in Birmingham.

AFB REGIONAL GROUPS

There are now anarchist groups in almost every part of the country. To find your nearest group write to:

Cornwall: A. Jacobs, 13 Ledrah Road, St. Austell. (M, Ma, B.)
Essex & E. Herts.: P. Newell, 'Aegean', Spring Lane, Eight Ash Green, Colchester. (QM, FL.)
Surrey: G. Wright, 47 College Road, Epsom.
Sussex: E. Poole, 5 Tilsbury, Findon Road, Whitehawk, Brighton.
Yorkshire: M. Watkins, 6 Ebberston Terrace, Leeds, 6.
Scotland: B. Lynn, 12 Ross Street, Glasgow.
Wales: c/o P. L. Mare (address above).
N. Ireland: c/o Freedom Press.
S. Ireland: c/o P. L. Mare (address above).
University and Student Groups: c/o P. L. Mare.
(Abbreviations: M—meeting; Ma—magazine; B—badges; Q—Quarterly; FL—free leaflets

THE NO ANARC

THE YORKSH
Anarchist F
on Saturday 29t
Conference. Th
cussion was the
ference on
'Where We Sta
AFB. Complain
NWAF comrade
festo nor the co
any publicity b
many disagreed
letter has been s
port of the com
The discussion
be held at the
chester, on Dece
divided into tw
and its implicati
the conference.
wide differences
the NWAF and
On the subjec
its implications,
rades expressed
agreement with
manifesto was ir
that it gave the
the AFB into
The suggestion t
used as the basis
within the anarc
forward. The N
as putting the
with greater sens
a clearer pictur
the AFB stood
cussion a large
anarchist organi
with much emp
newspapers and
chester and Lee
this field), many
desire to see
their own local
It was the or

people may co
nature of society
strikes, squatting
A minor act of
to a great increa
sciousness. But
show that our
Workers' control
mental aim; why
factories run unc
(If a Liberal, D
his beliefs into
factory under 'c
we?) This woul
form of 'propaga
by experiment,
arguments abou
control.

A DEFENCE O

We can imagi
lutionary organ
either gradually
come to run the
be the revolutio
must do what w
further the caus
many faults, som

guage of Anarchism

eption which has be-
ead over the USA dur-
r 4 decades as to com-
so-called 'objective,
ip'. He doesn't waste
on those lunatics who
ihilation of China and
nuclear weapons, but
for those 'responsible'
d advisers, to whom the
ith a fair amount of
time after time reveal
arious, much-publicized
pronouncements that
single moment, *do they*
a's absolute right to
power whenever and
es! All for splendidly
ble reasons, of course!
a familiar ring to it?
ght to, for Chomsky
staking scholarship, how
n spokesmen—particu-
economists and social
repeatedly expressing
old traditional rhetoric
It's all been said before
me way by the British,
Japanese and the Ger-
so much about 'Yankee
I for one regard the
icion—a slogan used as
honest criticism—but
with startling clarity
gic the fantastic extent
nerican intelligentsia of
not the Right, have
hole rotten imperialist

idea.

The acceptance of this imperialistic basis has tainted the fruits of American scholarship in many fields. To prove his point, Chomsky launches into a powerful critique of the histories of the Spanish Civil War—an astonishing tour de force for one whose field is linguistics, as he reveals a thorough knowledge of anarchist sources in 3 or 4 languages as well as having explored most of the better-known works on the subject. In fact, whether Chomsky calls himself an anarchist or not this essay is certainly sufficient to qualify him as one of the foremost anarchist historians of today—at least in the English-speaking countries. Anyone who has a specialized interest in Spain will find this essay (with 25 pages of detailed notes) an indispensable text.

This leads us to the question, Is Chomsky an anarchist? Possibly not, but in his introduction there is absolutely no ambiguity in *this* statement:

'To me it seems that the revival of anarchist thinking in the "New Left" and the attempts to put it into effect are the most promising development of the past years, and that if this development can solidify it offers some hope that the present American crisis will not become an American and world catastrophe.'

Chomsky's adversaries would probaly dismiss this remark as the attempt of a drowning man to clutch at straws, but to an anarchist it offers clear proof that Chomsky is not only acquainted with the negative side of anarchism, but has gone further and is well aware of the positive nature of anarchist proposals for social and political reorganization.

Rather than pin unwanted labels on the man, though, it is enough to let his book speak for itself. I was struck by a certain similarity to Orwell's writings in that neither Orwell nor Chomsky are what is now called 'pragmatists' — i.e. liars. Orwell once wrote that the most terrible lesson he learned from the Spanish Civil War was that objective truth seemed to be disappearing as a concept. Himself an eminently honest man, he would have none of this strategic deceit, fulminated against it, and always strove to write as clearly and as honestly as he could. Chomsky follows the same path, stressing such human values as honesty, compassion, independence, and restraint. He will have nothing to do with arguments based on expediency and again and again hammers at the point that Americans should not be asking themselves 'How best to . . . ?' but 'Have we the right to. . . . ?' The implicit assumption, 'Yes, we do have the right to . . . ' based on nothing more than superior strength and wealth, is deeply rooted in the minds of an overwhelming majority of American politicians and their advisors and is to Chomsky a clear indication that the USA is following the very same road as 'the fascist aggressors of a generation ago'.

Although I have barely scratched the surface in trying to give some idea of the content of this book, I feel I should close with a compliment on the readability of such a morally serious and scholarly work. Chomsky is a master of irony and satire, castigating his opponents in remorseless fashion with sustained attacks that can last for several pages. Take this quote from a review of Schlesinger's *Bitter Heritage*:

'(Schlesinger) knows that "our bombers roam over the hapless country (Vietnam) dumping more tonnage of explosives each month than we were dropping per month on all Europe and Africa during the Second World War". And he understands the effects on the civilian population of this attack, unprecedented in scale in the history of warfare. All of this arouses in the author feelings of great compassion—for President Johnson ("No thoughtful American can withhold sympathy as President Johnson ponders the gloomy choices which lie ahead.")

'It is not that Schlesinger is incapable of indignation. He is properly irate about the "warfare in the shadows" of the Vietcong, their "ambush and assassination and torture, leaving behind a trail of burned villages, shattered families, and weeping women" (the trail of burned villages is not further identified but perhaps the cast of characters has become confused at this point); and he is not lacking in contempt for those who mob the Secretary of Defense or burn draft cards. One wonders whether he would have been equally offended by a comparable "outpouring of emotion" in Italy in 1935 or Russia in 1956. . . . '

DAVE POULSON.

*Available from Freedom Bookshop, 8/6d. inc. post.

onev, who discusses the
st movement, did not
y to mention the two
st figures—Bakunin and
they had never existed.
t this learned professor
ceal from the masses of
ne names of these two
Anarchists.
nev does endeavour to
le is to convince the
Anarchists were highly
cters; he alleges, for
e entire Russian Anar-
consisted of criminals
lusively in murder and
ntends that the Anar-
ne extreme of printing
acy; that they all went
th bombs and revolvers,
uted a great peril to
as for that reason that
ne decided to deport all
beria'. Apparently the
rs made their hireling
et about the millions of
th by his government.
om Moscow, Zastenker,
article the European
ent, and devotes special
philosophy of Prud-

It is encouraging to know that in enslaved Russia sparks of a new life have manifested themselves. Indeed, several days ago I made the acquaintance of a man who maintains some connections with Soviet Russia and he confirmed that in the Soviet Union an underground Anarchist movement exists. However, the two articles in question by the abovementioned professors likewise suffice to lead one to believe than an Anarchist movement presently exists in Russia.

BERL KAVKAZER.

OPEN FORUM

TOWARDS AN ANARCHIST MANIFESTO

FUNDAMENTALS

NO INDIVIDUAL, or group of individuals, has the right to dominate any other individual or group. This simple belief is at the root of my anarchist philosophy. We thus immediately reject all types of government, all forms of exploitation at work (whether under capitalism or state-capitalism), all imperialism and colonialism, and incidentally all hierarchical organisations.

A revolutionary needs an analysis of present society, a vision of the ideal

THE NORTHERN ANARCHIST CONFERENCE

THE YORKSHIRE and North-West Anarchist Federations got together on Saturday 29th for the first Northern Conference. The main topic for discussion was the forthcoming AFB Conference on Manchester's proposed 'Where We Stand' manifesto for the AFB. Complaints were made by the NWAF comrades that neither the manifesto nor the conference had been given any publicity by FREEDOM and, whilst many disagreed with the manifesto, a letter has been sent to FREEDOM in support of the complaints.

The discussion on the conference (to be held at the University Union, Manchester, on December 13 and 14) can be divided into two areas: the manifesto and its implications and the format of the conference. On both these points wide differences of opinion separated the NWAF and YAF.

On the subject of the manifesto and its implications, many Yorkshire comrades expressed the opinion, whilst in agreement with most points, that the manifesto was irrelevant to anarchy and that it gave the impression of turning the AFB into another political party. The suggestion that it could perhaps be

coming conference, with delegates, observers and voting, that revealed the biggest split between the two federations. The NWAF explained that this format was necessary to ensure democratic working of the conference and of the AFB but did not see the vote as being binding. The YAF replied that voting was both irrelevant and, in this context, not in the spirit of anarchy, seeing the AFB as a get-together body where news and views are exchanged rather than a specifically political institution.

A suggestion that the AFB Internal Bulletin should consist of sheets written and duplicated by individuals and groups, then sent to the AFB office for stapling into the magazine is to be sent from the conference. This was seen as being both practical in spreading costs and work-load and as a working example of the federal principle.

It may be in some ways misleading to have referred to the NWAF and YAF as if they are opposing institutions but the differences were well marked with a high degree of unanimity within each group. Despite these wide differences of approach, there will be more Northern Conferences and everyone

merican intelligentsia of not the Right, have whole rotten imperialist

drowning man to clutch at straws, but to an anarchist it offers clear proof that Chomsky is not only acquainted with 'the fascist aggressors of a generation ago'.

Although I have barely scratched the

DAVE POULSON.

*Available from Freedom Bookshop, 8/6d. inc. post.

onev, who discusses the ist movement, did not ry to mention the two ist figures—Bakunin and they had never existed. t this learned professor ceal from the masses of he names of these two Anarchists.

onev does endeavour to cle is to convince the Anarchists were highly cters; he alleges, for e entire Russian Anar- consisted of criminals clusively in murder and ntends that the Anar- he extreme of printing ncy; that they all went th bombs and revolvers, tuted a great peril to as for that reason that ne decided to deport all iberia'. Apparently the rs made their hireling et about the millions of th by his government. rom Moscow, Zastenker, article the European ent, and devotes special philosophy of Prud- same professor further- utterly absurd statement and all fascists and adherents of this French such nonsense that vir- ssay by Prof. Zastenker

idiotic devices that the resorted to combat the impelled by an over- fear. But the Anarchist roots during the period sian Social Revolution. as the Anarchist move- e in Russia, it is still that the liberty-loving there. And despite the ation that new victims and new sacrifices, still ort from the knowledge e still finds elements in who dare to protest ss tyrants.

f Britain

to them or to the AFB office in Birmingham.

IONAL GROUPS

rchist groups in almost every To find your nearest group

13 Ledrah Road, St. Austell.

P. Newell, 'Aegean', Spring reen, Colchester. (QM, FL.) 7 College Road, Epsom. lisbury, Findon Road, White-

kins, 6 Ebberston Terrace,

2 Ross Street, Glasgow. re (address above). om Press. Mare (address above).

t Groups: c/o P. L. Mare. —meeting; Ma—magazine; arterly; FL—free leaflets

It is encouraging to know that in enslaved Russia sparks of a new life have manifested themselves. Indeed, several days ago I made the acquaintance of a man who maintains some connections with Soviet Russia and he confirmed that in the Soviet Union an underground Anarchist movement exists. However, the two articles in question by the abovementioned professors likewise suffice to lead one to believe than an Anarchist movement presently exists in Russia.

BERL KAVKAZER.

OPEN FORUM

TOWARDS AN ANARCHIST MANIFESTO

FUNDAMENTALS

NO INDIVIDUAL, or group of individuals, has the right to dominate any other individual or group. This simple belief is at the root of my anarchist philosophy. We thus immediately reject all types of government, all forms of exploitation at work (whether under capitalism or state-capitalism), all imperialism and colonialism, and incidentally all hierarchical organisations.

A revolutionary needs an analysis of present society, a vision of the ideal society, and some idea of how to turn one into the other. The first is easy to acquire: the country is run by a power élite (estimated at up to 5,000) ranging from cabinet ministers and top civil servants to bankers and army chiefs. These are the people who make the decisions which affect our lives; whether they are aware of their collective power is irrelevant. The formal machinery of 'democracy' (Parliament) is merely a method by which minor pressure groups (the political parties) impinge on the Government. The élite's power stems from its control of the economy, education, and public opinion, and ultimately by its control of the police and the armed forces.

As for our vision of Utopia, we can at least imagine parts of it: factories run by the workers, an absence of coercion and money, social services run by voluntary associations. But how can we transform society in the way we wish? It is easy enough to pick out individual evils, and to oppose them. But to change the very structure of society requires, by definition, a revolution. It is the nature and methods of the revolutionary organisation which cause most arguments on the 'Left'.

METHODS

Bakunin once said: 'One cannot bring about a libertarian society by means of an authoritarian organisation.' I would add that one is unlikely to bring about a society based on peace and brotherhood by means of a violent organisation, and would remind comrades of Michels' 'Iron Law': that **all** organisations tend to oligarchy.

Revolutionaries have two main tasks: to convince people that fundamental change is necessary and desirable, and to show that it is possible. The development of 'consciousness' is important—people may come to realise the true nature of society through demonstrations, strikes, squatting, or other confrontations. A minor act of rebellion can give rise to a great increase in revolutionary consciousness. But we must go further, and show that our Utopia is practicable. Workers' control of industry is a fundamental aim; why don't we set up a few factories run under a variety of systems? (If a Liberal, David Spreckley, can put his beliefs into practice by running a factory under 'co-partnership', why can't we?) This would be a highly effective form of 'propaganda by deed', and might, by experiment, end some of the sterile arguments about methods of workers' control.

A DEFENCE OF REFORMISM

We can imagine our libertarian revolutionary organisation growing until, either gradually or suddenly, the people come to run their own affairs. This will be the revolution. At the moment, we must do what we can, however little, to further the cause. Present society has many faults, some of them not necessarily connected with its structure. We should work for change with all the means at our disposal. For example, there is a severe housing shortage. Appropriation of unused property (squatting) is the correct revolutionary action. But we could occupy every empty house in the country and still have a serious housing problem. Is it so wrong to agitate for a solution in Parliament? Or must the homeless families wait for the Revolution?

The standard anarchist answer is that Parliamentary action helps to perpetuate the present system. Well, many anarchists (myself included) work for a living, thus helping to perpetuate the capitalist system. We seem to square it with our consciences. Our task is to change the world, and I would rather see some improvements now than wait for the distant revolution. Is it better to travel hopefully than to arrive?

MARSHALL EAGLE.

(More articles on anarchism needed for this column.—Eds.)

THE NORTHERN ANARCHIST CONFERENCE

THE YORKSHIRE and North-West Anarchist Federations got together on Saturday 29th for the first Northern Conference. The main topic for discussion was the forthcoming AFB Conference on Manchester's proposed 'Where We Stand' manifesto for the AFB. Complaints were made by the NWAF comrades that neither the manifesto nor the conference had been given any publicity by FREEDOM and, whilst many disagreed with the manifesto, a letter has been sent to FREEDOM in support of the complaints.

The discussion on the conference (to be held at the University Union, Manchester, on December 13 and 14) can be divided into two areas: the manifesto and its implications and the format of the conference. On both these points wide differences of opinion separated the NWAF and YAF.

On the subject of the manifesto and its implications, many Yorkshire comrades expressed the opinion, whilst in agreement with most points, that the manifesto was irrelevant to anarchy and that it gave the impression of turning the AFB into another political party. The suggestion that it could perhaps be used as the basis as a national grouping within the anarchist movement was put forward. The NWAF saw the manifesto as putting the AFB on a firmer base with greater sense of direction and giving a clearer picture to outsiders of what the AFB stood for. During the discussion a large number of aspects of anarchist organisation were considered with much emphasis on the role of newspapers and magazines (both Manchester and Leeds having experience in this field), many comrades expressing a desire to see more groups producing their own local newspapers.

It was the organisation of the forthcoming conference, with delegates, observers and voting, that revealed the biggest split between the two federations. The NWAF explained that this format was necessary to ensure democratic working of the conference and of the AFB but did not see the vote as being binding. The YAF replied that voting was both irrelevant and, in this context, not in the spirit of anarchy, seeing the AFB as a get-together body where news and views are exchanged rather than a specifically political institution.

A suggestion that the AFB Internal Bulletin should consist of sheets written and duplicated by individuals and groups, then sent to the AFB office for stapling into the magazine is to be sent from the conference. This was seen as being both practical in spreading costs and work-load and as a working example of the federal principle.

It may be in some ways misleading to have referred to the NWAF and YAF as if they are opposing institutions but the differences were well marked with a high degree of unanimity within each group. Despite these wide differences of approach, there will be more Northern Conferences and everyone hoped that the Manchester Conference will be well attended to get the manifesto question properly sorted out.

(D.J., YAF).

The provisional agenda for the conference is:

1. Discussion of 'Where We Stand';
2. Organisation of the Federation;
3. Organs and papers of the Federation;

at the University Union, Manchester on December 13 and 14.

Other groups are invited to add to the agenda.

Correspondence and enquiries to John Walker, 92 Clyde Road, Manchester, 20.

With Friends Like These—Who Needs Enemies ?

SOMETIMES IT GETS so as one does not want to get out of bed in the morning. It seems that this is just not our week.

We have received:

(a) A resolution from a pre-conference inter-federation get-together at Leeds signed by 21 comrades deploring the fact that FREEDOM did not publish the letter from the Manchester Group informing the movement of the forthcoming AFB conference. (This is referred to as 'censorship'.)

(b) A copy of *Solidarity*, Vol. 6, No. 2 (no date) deploring FREEDOM'S failure to publish an article to follow up a letter (which we did publish—Sept. 27) commenting on inaccuracies in a report of an ISRACA demo in FREEDOM (Aug. 23). This detailed article was not published neither was a following letter (which for the eager few is published in *Solidarity*, Vol. 6, No. 2).

It will not have escaped the notice of our readers that we have had our own troubles since August. We still operate with a part-time editorial staff; we have one editor off sick and our premises were commandeered, burgled and raided and spied on by the police. We have emerged bloody and broke but unbowed and in debt to the amount of £1,326.

As to the Northern Conference we freely admit we forgot to put the notice in. When we recollected it in the tranquillity of after-editorial meetings we reflected that the notice had been circulated throughout the groups and we felt that no real harm had been done. We were, it seems, wrong.

A second factor that made us feel that we were not doing the *anarchist* movement a great disservice were the principles circulated by the N.W. Federation, 'Where We Stand'. In this they appear to be merely 'libertarians' or, at their most revolutionary, in paragraph 5 (b), to be 'libertarian socialists'. Herewith the document:—

NORTH WEST FEDERATION
OF ANARCHISTS
WHERE WE STAND

(1) **Workers' Control** — We oppose nationalisation because it does not place power in the hands of the workers, but in the hands of the State, which represents the power of the bosses and the politicians. We advocate a system of organisation in which the means of production are directly controlled by the workers themselves at shop floor level, and where industry is not organised on the basis of the profit motive but, linked by federal structure, on the basis of the needs of the people as a whole.

(2) **Capitalism and The State** — We recognise that the present malaise of society lies in its capitalist class organisation which concentrates control and power in the hands of a few. The State is the means by which the capitalist class exercise this power. As libertarians we realise that the capture of State power cannot change the basic class organisation of society. Both capitalism and the State can only be destroyed by the direct action of the working class itself.

(3) **Reformism** — Reformists attempt to use the power of the State to alleviate the worst effects of the capitalist system. In so doing they accept the authority of the State which we, as libertarians, reject.

(4) **Imperialism and National Liberation** — We support all national liberation struggles against Imperialism as a step towards social revolution.

(5) **Authoritarianism** — (a) Social Organisation; much of the continuing power of capitalist and authoritarian 'socialist' systems lies in their adherence to centralist forms of organisation, which deprive the vast majority of the working population of any means of social expression. We oppose centralist forms of organisation for this reason.

(b) Revolutionary organisation; as we reject centralist forms of social organisation, so we reject centralist forms of revolutionary organisation. Attempts to build a 'Vanguard' party can only inhibit the development of a revolutionary social consciousness among the people as a whole. The North West Federation of Anarchists, as a revolutionary organisation is pledged to organise itself on the principles of libertarian socialism. Accordingly it constitutes itself as an individual membership body, organised through groups on a federal basis for co-ordinated regional activity, with all delegates to Federation meetings and conferences subject to the right of immediate recall by the local group membership.

We leave it to
whether this was wo
In any case we thou
in an internal bulle
As for our old c
they have been arou
long to be really
what we do or do
In the words of H
can't stand the hea
of the kitchen'.
Whether what C
about ISRACA wa
not at this point ca
We thought our
Kirkley's letter on S
for we haven't got t
money) to waste o
of stale anarcho-M
We do exercise
simple fact that not
can go in FREEDOM
the dear daft dotty
who thinks the poli
or the comrade
thinks the anarchis
logical warfare or t
to vote liberal. We
ship of taste, discre
pose. As the anar
proved for weeding
a preference for rose

Integrated Education

Dear Comrades,

'Wobbly' says that many people just don't realise how different the two communities in Ireland are (FREEDOM, 15.11.69). I can honestly say that I understand better than most. My father has often told me about the very tough district of Clydebank where he grew up. The pupils of Elgin Street School were locked in on Saint Patrick's Day, from early morning till bedtime, for their own protection. RC schools took similar precautions on the Twelfth. Pop joined the Orange Lodge of course. 'I had to, we needed their support. There were only two or three Protestant families in the whole of John Knox Street.'

The history or mythology with which I am most familiar is Scottish and Protestant. When I see the Pope on television newsreel, certain pictures flash through my mind: young Patrick Hamilton, musician and poet, who was burnt in several stages, dying with hideous slowness; George Wishart, teacher of Greek at Montrose Academy, also burnt alive; and John Knox, emaciated, covered with sores, suffering from dysentery, chained to an oar of the slave galley 'Notre Dame'; in short, I'm scared stiff.

It's obvious where my **emotional** sympathies lie, though, like everyone else, I'm disgusted with the B-Specials and Orange fanatics. I've read quite a bit about the 'Irish Problem', and my conout a probable development, which may be considered good or bad, I would now like to make a constructive suggestion to our Irish comrades. We frequently hear nowadays about 'revolt' within the Roman Catholic Church. Laity, priests, bishops, even cardinals are said to be at odds with the Vatican. Personally, I don't think the Church of Rome is any place for people of liberal views. But if you have any influence at all with the RC community, or if you know anyone who has such influence, then you should demand integrated education. In practice, this will mean state education, which is bad enough, but a vast improvement on the sectarian type; and there are teachers trying to change the system from within. The separation of children on grounds which they don't understand is responsible for more trouble than any other single factor, and this separation is decreed by the Roman Catholic Church.

Fraternally,

DAVE COULL.

Letters

Fraternal Greetings

above all, we wish that amongst all libertarians there should reign a feeling of fraternity and mutual aid, such as Kropotkin defined so perfectly, and without which no task of importance can succeed.

We believe that only in this way can concerted and intelligent action bring about fruitful results, thus converting our attempts into something real and vital relevant to the environment in which we evolve.

Any libertarian esperantists, wherever they may live, who believe that by contributing their efforts the Liberecana Frakcio de SAT can do useful work towards achieving the ideals for which we struggle, will be welcomed with fraternal affection. Only through strong will and collaboration between libertarian idealists will our aims gather strength and become a reality.

For further information regarding the Liberecana Frakcio de SAT and correspondence courses in ESPERANTO please contact:

Nereida Martínez
36 rue du 4 Septembre
91-Igny (Francia).

Boycott South Africa

THE AFRICAN NATIONAL CONGRESS OF SOUTH AFRICA welcomes the statement by the National Executive of the Labour Party in which it condemns racialism in sport and in

be understood that
grate to South Afri
parasites, to enrich
expense. It must
when trade is co
Africa, it is in sup
tem of legalised
majority of the p
minority. The So
minority depends a
sort of relationship
task of defeating
considerably easier.
evitable. Apartheid

(*Sign*

49 *Rathbone Street*
London W1A-4NL
28.11.69

Action &

Dear Comrades,

The perpetual arg
vidualists at one e
spectrum and comm
constantly being de
of *'divide et impera*
agreement between
effect the means wh
may be brought ab

What we need to
tically conscious is
anarchist literature,
and holding of meet
These activities nee
advanced political th
why they do not ha
of the laziness of
'We haven't enough

Integrated Education

Dear Comrades,

'Wobbly' says that many people just don't realise how different the two communities in Ireland are (FREEDOM, 15.11.69). I can honestly say that I understand better than most. My father has often told me about the very tough district of Clydebank where he grew up. The pupils of Elgin Street School were locked in on Saint Patrick's Day, from early morning till bedtime, for their own protection. RC schools took similar precautions on the Twelfth. Pop joined the Orange Lodge of course. 'I had to, we needed their support. There were only two or three Protestant families in the whole of John Knox Street.'

The history or mythology with which I am most familiar is Scottish and Protestant. When I see the Pope on television newsreel, certain pictures flash through my mind: young Patrick Hamilton, musician and poet, who was burnt in several stages, dying with hideous slowness; George Wishart, teacher of Greek at Montrose Academy, also burnt alive; and John Knox, emaciated, covered with sores, suffering from dysentery, chained to an oar of the slave galley 'Notre Dame'; in short, I'm scared stiff.

It's obvious where my **emotional** sympathies lie, though, like everyone else, I'm disgusted with the B-Specials and Orange fanatics. I've read quite a bit about the 'Irish Problem', and my conclusions are the usual ones; that the exploited should unite against their exploiters, etc. Unlike 'Wobbly', I think this might happen one of these days. Ireland is, after all, part of a rapidly changing world. There is no longer such a thing as the closed society, if there ever was.

However, assuming that there are no revolutionary (or reactionary) upheavals in the near future, what can be done about Northern Ireland? Let's consider a **probable** course of events. The offshore islands of Europe consist of several nations but, at present, only two states. An attempt was made, dating from around 1746, to create a 'United Kingdom' in which the people would consider themselves 'Britons'. The optimism of that period is typified by the song 'Rule Britannia' (written, of course, by a Scot —our lot believed more deeply in 'Britain' than the Sassenachs ever did).

It is now becoming clearer every day, even to those who regret it, that this experiment of the 'United Kingdom' has failed, and no amount of flag-waving can disguise this fact. It is likely that, in years to come, there will be the 'independent' states of Scotland, England, and Wales, plus several semi-autonomous territories. Under these circumstances, the Republic of Ireland would probably welcome membership of a 'Britannic Confederation' (or whatever it may be called) and join with her partners in guaranteeing the rights of both communities in Ulster. Ian Paisley and the 26-county expansionists would look equally obsolete. This would be a logical outcome of the inevitable break-up of the 'United Kingdom'.

So, the rock of Orange politics is really shifting sand (though fear of 'popery' is older than the Order and will undoubtedly outlive it). Having pointed out a probable development, which may be considered good or bad, I would now like to make a constructive suggestion to our Irish comrades. We frequently hear nowadays about 'revolt' within the Roman Catholic Church. Laity, priests, bishops, even cardinals are said to be at odds with the Vatican. Personally, I don't think the Church of Rome is any place for people of liberal views. But if you have any influence at all with the RC community, or if you know anyone who has such influence, then you should demand integrated education. In practice, this will mean state education, which is bad enough, but a vast improvement on the sectarian type; and there are teachers trying to change the system from within. The separation of children on grounds which they don't understand is responsible for more trouble than any other single factor, and this separation is decreed by the Roman Catholic Church.

Fraternally,

DAVE COULL.

Letters

Fraternal Greetings

IT is THROUGH the international anarchist press that we make known to all who share our ideas, the reorganisation of the Sennacieca Asocio Tutmonda Libertarian Group. Coinciding with the Sat-Amikaro Congress, which took place in Paris from April 5 to 8, it was agreed by various acratic bodies that it was of vital importance to revive a movement which previously possessed even its own press, and which had been falling into decay due to wars and totalitarian governments.

We send greetings to libertarian esperantists living all over the world, extending our greetings to acratic groups and bodies in general. With our greeting goes the desire to contribute with all our strength and ability to spreading our ideals which today are more than ever proved right in the face of the ominous course followed by the capitalist world, and the complete failure of all political sectors ranging from the democratic to the totalitarian fascist and marxist policies.

Greetings to those who, on account of their ideas for social reform, suffer loss of freedom in prison cells and concentration camps. Greetings to those who are persecuted and fight in clandestinity in totalitarian countries. To all who, moved by their humanitarian desire for justice, fight for a social structure more fair and equal than our present one.

We want our ideas to leave their mark in the widely dispersed field of world esperanto. We wish the seed of libertarian ideas to take root in the young worker and the university student. We want to unite to the concepts held by the most advanced thinkers amongst anarchist intellectuals, all that is progressively alive in the moral and material sense in our contemporary culture. And, above all, we wish that amongst all libertarians there should reign a feeling of fraternity and mutual aid, such as Kropotkin defined so perfectly, and without which no task of importance can succeed.

We believe that only in this way can concerted and intelligent action bring about fruitful results, thus converting our attempts into something real and vital relevant to the environment in which we evolve.

Any libertarian esperantists, wherever they may live, who believe that by contributing their efforts the Liberecana Frakcio de SAT can do useful work towards achieving the ideals for which we struggle, will be welcomed with fraternal affection. Only through strong will and collaboration between libertarian idealists will our aims gather strength and become a reality.

For further information regarding the Liberecana Frakcio de SAT and correspondence courses in ESPERANTO please contact:

Nereida Martínez
36 rue du 4 Septembre
91-Igny (Francia).

Boycott South Africa

THE AFRICAN NATIONAL CONGRESS OF SOUTH AFRICA welcomes the statement by the National Executive of the Labour Party in which it condemns racialism in sport and in which it indicated that teams should not be invited to the United Kingdom if they are selected on a racial basis.

Further, we wish to place on record our special appreciation to the Anti-Apartheid Movement, the 'Stop the 70 Tour Committee', and in fact all organisations and individuals which have demonstrated their rejection—in one way or another—of the present rugby tour by the so-called South African side.

We should make it clear that the introduction of politics into sport, by the South African authorities, is inevitable. Apartheid-permeating — as it does—all aspects of life; political, social, economic and cultural. In fact, as it has been said: 'This monster of Apartheid follows us from the cradle to the grave.'

While welcoming the magnificent manner in which the people of the United Kingdom are reacting to the imposition of racialism on sport here, we are duty bound to draw the attention of UK citizens to other, and perhaps more important, involvement.

The United Kingdom, despite the Labour Government, continues to be the biggest trading partner of South Africa. South Africa House, according to press reports, expects its contact list to consist of between 5,000 and 6,000 names in the United Kingdom by the end of the year. They also boast of 600 bookings for their propaganda films to be shown. This development should be reversed.

The fact that SA is the main pillar on which Smith's Rhodesia leans, is plain for all the world to see.

We must appeal to the people of this country to take note of this involvement. The people should extend their rejection of sport Apartheid to all other areas of involvement with South Africa. It must

Action &

Dear Comrades,

The perpetual ar
vidualists at one
spectrum and comm
constantly being de
of *'divide et impera*
agreement betwee
effect the means w
may be brought ab

What we need to
tically conscious is
anarchist literature,
and holding of mee
These activities nee
advanced political th
why they do not ha
of the laziness of
'We haven't enough
stantly being told by
This is nonsense. T
could plaster a mec
posters in a night a
ing the skinheads,
ground after a matc
of (to take a randor
could do more to fu
any number of pri
meetings.

Anarchist theoris
people to think, an
express their differe
the lack of argum
widespread ignoranc
tals of anarchist ph
stating one's detaile
an anarchist society
little practical use
has occurred, and to
in advance runs c
principle in that s
allowed to find its c
fact that one should
lop before saying w

In spite of all this
arguments stimulat
and should be en
reason why they sh
action and propaga
taining opposing vie
win over the public
one view only. Wh
and words, and neit
sive of the other.

CHRISTO
Colchester, Essex

URGENT. Will
groups in Wale
please contact t
any new groups
address.

be understood that
grate to South Afr
parasites, to enrich
expense. It must
when trade is co
Africa, it is in sup
tem of legalised
majority of the p
minority. The S
minority depends
sort of relationship
task of defeating
considerably easier.
evitable. Apartheid
(Sign

49 Rathbone Street
London WIA-4NL
28.11.69

ese—Who Needs Enemies ?

EDITORIAL

eetings we reflected
ıd been circulated
ps and we felt that
en done. We were,

at made us feel that
the *anarchist* move-
rice were the prin-
he N.W. Federation,
In this they appear
arians' or, at their
in paragraph 5 (b),
ocialists'. Herewith

FEDERATION
RCHISTS
E STAND

trol — We oppose
se it does not place
of the workers, but
State, which repre-
the bosses and the
ocate a system of
h the means of pro-
controlled by the
at shop floor level,
is not organised on
t motive but, linked
on the basis of the
s a whole.
d **The State** — We
present malaise of
pitalist class organi-
ntrates control and
of a few. The State
h the capitalist class
As libertarians we
ture of State power

cannot change the basic class organisation of society. Both capitalism and the State can only be destroyed by the direct action of the working class itself.

(3) **Reformism** — Reformists attempt to use the power of the State to alleviate the worst effects of the capitalist system. In so doing they accept the authority of the State which we, as libertarians, reject.

(4) **Imperialism and National Liberation** — We support all national liberation struggles against Imperialism as a step towards social revolution.

(5) **Authoritarianism** — (a) Social Organisation; much of the continuing power of capitalist and authoritarian 'socialist' systems lies in their adherence to centralist forms of organisation, which deprive the vast majority of the working population of any means of social expression. We oppose centralist forms of organisation for this reason.

(b) Revolutionary organisation; as we reject centralist forms of social organisation, so we reject centralist forms of revolutionary organisation. Attempts to build a 'Vanguard' party can only inhibit the development of a revolutionary social consciousness among the people as a whole. The North West Federation of Anarchists, as a revolutionary organisation is pledged to organise itself on the principles of libertarian socialism. Accordingly it constitutes itself as an individual membership body, organised through groups on a federal basis for co-ordinated regional activity, with all delegates to Federation meetings and conferences subject to the right of immediate recall by the local group membership.

We leave it to our readers to judge whether this was worth wasting space on. In any case we thought it would be better in an internal bulletin.

As for our old comrades of *Solidarity* they have been around in politics for too long to be really over-sensitive about what we do or do not say about them. In the words of Harry Truman 'if they can't stand the heat they should get out of the kitchen'.

Whether what Comrade Meltzer said about ISRACA was true or not we do not at this point care. History will judge. We thought our publishing of Don Kirkley's letter on Sept. 27 was sufficient, for we haven't got the space (which costs money) to waste on this alphabet soup of stale anarcho-Marxist mish-mash.

We do exercise a censorship by the simple fact that not everything we receive can go in FREEDOM. We cannot publish the dear daft dotty missive from the lady who thinks the police are following her, or the comrade who (anonymously) thinks the anarchists can use bacteriological warfare or the man who wants us to vote liberal. We must exercise censorship of taste, discretion, utility and purpose. As the anarchist said when reproved for weeding his garden: 'I have a preference for roses'.

BILL CHRISTOPHER
JACK ROBINSON
PHILIP SANSOM
PETER TURNER

---

opment, which may
r bad, I would now
structive suggestion
des. We frequently
't 'revolt' within the
urch. Laity, priests,
als are said to be at
ican. Personally, I
rch of Rome is any
liberal views. But
ience at all with the
f you know anyone
ce, then you should
education. In prac-
n state education,
but a vast improve-
an type; and there
change the system
paration of children
ey don't understand
re trouble than any
nd this separation is
an Catholic Church.
nally,

DAVE COULL.

above all, we wish that amongst all libertarians there should reign a feeling of fraternity and mutual aid, such as Kropotkin defined so perfectly, and without which no task of importance can succeed.

We believe that only in this way can concerted and intelligent action bring about fruitful results, thus converting our attempts into something real and vital relevant to the environment in which we evolve.

Any libertarian esperantists, wherever they may live, who believe that by contributing their efforts the Liberecana Frakcio de SAT can do useful work towards achieving the ideals for which we struggle, will be welcomed with fraternal affection. Only through strong will and collaboration between libertarian idealists will our aims gather strength and become a reality.

For further information regarding the Liberecana Frakcio de SAT and correspondence courses in ESPERANTO please contact:

Nereida Martínez
36 rue du 4 Septembre
91-Igny (Francia).

Boycott South Africa

THE AFRICAN NATIONAL CONGRESS OF SOUTH AFRICA welcomes the statement by the National Executive of the Labour Party in which it condemns racialism in sport and in which it indicated that teams should not

be understood that when workers emigrate to South Africa, they go there as parasites, to enrich themselves at our expense. It must be understood that when trade is conducted with South Africa, it is in support of a rotten system of legalised enslavement of the majority of the people by the white minority. The South African white minority depends a great deal on this sort of relationship, without which our task of defeating Apartheid would be considerably easier.

evitable. Apartheid—permeating—as it

(*Signed*) REG. SEPTEMBER,
Chief Representative.

49 *Rathbone Street*
London W1A-4NL
28.11.69

Action & Words

Dear Comrades,

The perpetual argument between individualists at one end of the anarchist spectrum and communists at the other is constantly being denounced, on the basis of '*divide et impera*'. Yet surely this disagreement between anarchists cannot effect the means whereby the revolution may be brought about.

What we need to make the public politically conscious is more distribution of anarchist literature, sticking of posters, and holding of meetings in public places. These activities need not be affected by advanced political theorising. The reason why they do not happen more is because of the laziness of professed anarchists. 'We haven't enough people,' I am constantly being told by one anarchist group

books ?

we can supply any book in print

SECONDHAND

We have a large stock of secondhand books. Try us for what you want. This weeks selection.

Bryn Roberts and the National Union of Public Employees	W. W. Craik	5/-
The Life of Madame Roland	Madeleine Clemenceau-Jacquemaire	6/-
Bertrand Russell: a Pictorial Biography	H. W. Leggett	4/-
Autobiography of a German Rebel	Toni Sender	4/-
Ariel: a Shelley Romance	André Maurois	3/6
My Five Lives	G. F. Stridsberg	5/-
Herbert Spencer	J. Arthur Thomson (binding broken)	3/6
Time's Winged Chariot	Ernest Thurtle	5/-
First Things First	Frank Tilsley	3/-
The Man of Independence (Harry Truman)	Jonathan Daniels	3/-
Four Portraits	Peter Quennell	3/-
Liquor Control	G. E. C. Catlin	3/6
Mother Goose—Censored		3/-
The Big Puff	Thomas Whiteside	3/6
The New Propaganda	Amber Blanco White	3/-
The Magic of Monarchy	Kingsley Martin	4/-
The Abdication of Edward VIII	J. Lincoln White	3/-
The Bloodless Pogrom	Fritz Siedler	6/-
Dark Ghetto	Kenneth B. Clarke	6/-
Why I am a Jew	Edmond Fleg	3/-

POSTAGE EXTRA

Freedom Bookshop

HERE WE ARE !

Note new telephone number:
BIShopsgate 9249

New address:
84B WHITECHAPEL HIGH STREET,
(entrance Angel Alley),
WHITECHAPEL, E.1.
(Underground: Aldgate East. Exit: Whitechapel Art Gallery. Turn right on emerging from station.)

FREEDOM PRESS and Bookshop Opening times:

Closed Monday, Sunday.
Tuesday–Friday, 3–7 p.m.
Saturday, 10 a.m.–4 p.m.

FREEDOM PRESS

are the publishers
of the monthly magazine
ANARCHY
and the weekly journal
FREEDOM
specimen copies will be

rs

Greetings

the international

lopment, which may
or bad, I would now
nstructive suggestion
des. We frequently
t 'revolt' within the
urch. Laity, priests,
als are said to be at
ican. Personally, I
rch of Rome is any
liberal views. But
uence at all with the
if you know anyone
nce, then you should
education. In prac-
an state education,
but a vast improve-
ian type; and there
change the system
eparation of children
hey don't understand
ore trouble than any
nd this separation is
an Catholic Church.
nally,

DAVE COULL.

rs

Greetings

l the international
nat we make known
ideas, the reorgani-
acieca Asocio Tut-
Group. Coinciding
ro Congress, which
from April 5 to 8,
rious acratic bodies
importance to revive
previously possessed
and which had been
e to wars and total-

ngs to libertarian
ll over the world,
gs to acratic groups
. With our greeting
ntribute with all our
to spreading our
are more than ever
face of the ominous
the capitalist world,
ilure of all political
n the democratic to
scist and marxist

who, on account of
l reform, suffer loss
son cells and con-
Greetings to those
and fight in clan-
an countries. To all
ir humanitarian de-
ight for a social
and equal than our

to leave their mark
rsed field of world
the seed of liber-
root in the young
versity student. We
e concepts held by
thinkers amongst
ls, all that is pro-
e moral and material
porary culture. And,

above all, we wish that amongst all libertarians there should reign a feeling of fraternity and mutual aid, such as Kropotkin defined so perfectly, and without which no task of importance can succeed.

We believe that only in this way can concerted and intelligent action bring about fruitful results, thus converting our attempts into something real and vital relevant to the environment in which we evolve.

Any libertarian esperantists, wherever they may live, who believe that by contributing their efforts the Liberecana Frakcio de SAT can do useful work towards achieving the ideals for which we struggle, will be welcomed with fraternal affection. Only through strong will and collaboration between libertarian idealists will our aims gather strength and become a reality.

For further information regarding the Liberecana Frakcio de SAT and correspondence courses in ESPERANTO please contact:

Nereida Martínez
36 rue du 4 Septembre
91-Igny (Francia).

Boycott South Africa

THE AFRICAN NATIONAL CONGRESS OF SOUTH AFRICA welcomes the statement by the National Executive of the Labour Party in which it condemns racialism in sport and in which it indicated that teams should not be invited to the United Kingdom if they are selected on a racial basis.

Further, we wish to place on record our special appreciation to the Anti-Apartheid Movement, the 'Stop the 70 Tour Committee', and in fact all organisations and individuals which have demonstrated their rejection—in one way or another—of the present rugby tour by the so-called South African side.

We should make it clear that the introduction of politics into sport, by the South African authorities, is inevitable. Apartheid-permeating — as it does—all aspects of life; political, social, economic and cultural. In fact, as it has been said: 'This monster of Apartheid follows us from the cradle to the grave.'

While welcoming the magnificent manner in which the people of the United Kingdom are reacting to the imposition of racialism on sport here, we are duty bound to draw the attention of UK citizens to other, and perhaps more important, involvement.

The United Kingdom, despite the Labour Government, continues to be the biggest trading partner of South Africa. South Africa House, according to press reports, expects its contact list to consist of between 5,000 and 6,000 names in the United Kingdom by the end of the year. They also boast of 600 bookings for their propaganda films to be shown. This development should be reversed.

The fact that SA is the main pillar on which Smith's Rhodesia leans, is plain for all the world to see.

We must appeal to the people of this country to take note of this involvement. The people should extend their rejection of sport Apartheid to all other areas of involvement with South Africa. It must be understood that when workers emigrate to South Africa, they go there as parasites, to enrich themselves at our expense. It must be understood that when trade is conducted with South Africa, it is in support of a rotten system of legalised enslavement of the majority of the people by the white minority. The South African white minority depends a great deal on this sort of relationship, without which our task of defeating Apartheid would be considerably easier.

evitable. Apartheid—permeating—as it

(*Signed*) REG. SEPTEMBER,
Chief Representative.

49 *Rathbone Street*
London WIA-4NL
28.11.69

Action & Words

Dear Comrades,

The perpetual argument between individualists at one end of the anarchist spectrum and communists at the other is constantly being denounced, on the basis of *'divide et impera'*. Yet surely this disagreement between anarchists cannot effect the means whereby the revolution may be brought about.

What we need to make the public politically conscious is more distribution of anarchist literature, sticking of posters, and holding of meetings in public places. These activities need not be affected by advanced political theorising. The reason why they do not happen more is because of the laziness of professed anarchists. 'We haven't enough people,' I am constantly being told by one anarchist group. This is nonsense. Three people in a car could plaster a medium-sized town with posters in a night and one person, braving the skinheads, outside a football ground after a match with a large bundle of (to take a random example) FREEDOM could do more to further our cause than any number of private anarchist group meetings.

Anarchist theorising helps by getting people to think, and if people did not express their different political opinions, the lack of argument would result in widespread ignorance of the fundamentals of anarchist philosophy. Of course stating one's detailed opinion as to what an anarchist society should be like is of little practical use until the revolution has occurred, and to fossilise one's views in advance runs counter to anarchist principle in that society ought to be allowed to find its own way of living, in fact that one should see how things develop before saying what ought to happen.

In spite of all this, theoretical anarchist arguments stimulate people's thoughts and should be encouraged. I see no reason why they should hinder anarchist action and propaganda. Literature containing opposing views is more likely to win over the public than that containing one view only. What we want is action **and** words, and neither should be exclusive of the other.

CHRISTOPHER HARGREAVES.
Colchester, Essex

URGENT. Will Student groups, groups in Wales and S. Ireland, please contact the AFB. (Also any new groups and changes of address.

The Magic of Monarchy
Kingsley Martin 4/-
The Abdication of Edward VIII
J. Lincoln White 3/-
The Bloodless Pogrom Fritz Siedler 6/-
Dark Ghetto Kenneth B. Clarke 6/-
Why I am a Jew Edmond Fleg 3/-

POSTAGE EXTRA

Freedom Bookshop

HERE WE ARE!

Note new telephone number:
BIShopsgate 9249

New address:
84B WHITECHAPEL HIGH STREET,
(entrance Angel Alley),
WHITECHAPEL, E.1.
(Underground: Aldgate East. Exit: Whitechapel Art Gallery. Turn right on emerging from station.)

FREEDOM PRESS and Bookshop Opening times:

Closed Monday, Sunday.
Tuesday–Friday, 3–7 p.m.
Saturday, 10 a.m.–4 p.m.

FREEDOM PRESS

are the publishers
of the monthly magazine
ANARCHY
and the weekly journal
FREEDOM
specimen copies will be
sent on request.

PUBLICATIONS include

Berkman's
ABC of ANARCHISM 2/6 (+5d.)
Rocker's
NATIONALISM AND
CULTURE 21/- (+4/6)
Richards'
MALATESTA: His Life and Ideas
Cloth bound 21/- (+1/3)
Full list on application.

STILL CRITICAL!

PRESS FUND
November 25–December 1
London, S.E.19: R.R. 5/-; **London, N.W.1:** P.L. £6; **Cambridge:** A.G. £2; **East Grinstead:** O.M. £5; **Camden:** D.G. 10/-; **Colchester:** P.N. £1; **Goteburg:** Y.T.-S. 13/3; **Lausanne:** R.J. & M.M. £4; **London, W.8:** P.J.P. £2; **Vernier:** K.K. £3; **Dorset:** C.P. 5/-; **Rome:** D.W. £10; **Hove:** B.P. 3/6; **Loughborough Group:** £5; **Wolverhampton:** J.K.W. 2/-; K.F. & C.F. 2/-; J.L. 3/-.

Total:	**£40 3 9**
Previously Acknowledged:	**£170 15 8**
	£210 19 5
Still needed:	**£790 0 0**

The Truth about Tilbury

AS REPORTED IN FREEDOM (November 22) the propaganda war against dockers is hotting up because of their refusal to accept drastic reductions in manning on container berths where mechanisation is used.

When Tilbury dockers met and decided by a small majority to continue this official policy of the union, the main firm which wanted to operate a container berth (Overseas Containers Limited) decided to switch to Antwerp.

Immediately the press and television splashed the news and came out with the tired old clichés about wrecking the economy and driving away valuable trade and so on.

The good old *Daily Mirror* came out with its predictable ill-informed attack on the dockers. Naively, it asks, 'Do the dockers really want to strangle the Port of London and, with it, their own jobs, their own pay packets and their own future?'

Had the writer of this rubbish paused to think, he would surely have realised dockers are the last people who want to strangle their own jobs and pay packets. That is precisely why they refused to work a system which needs only ten per cent of the existing labour force until everybody is guaranteed a reasonable living, not just one in ten.

Amid all the anti-working-class propaganda the *Mirror* makes one vague reference to this—'Everybody understands the dockers' fears about redundancy and determination to win more security but surely there are better and more rational tactics than driving customers away from their own industry.' The point is of course that there are no more rational tactics as the only alternatives given to them by the employers was work with a tenth of the conventional manning or not at all. To accept such a drastic cut in manning is hardly tactical, it's just plain suicide.

Sir Andrew Crichton (Chairman of OCL) said the move would cost them up to an extra £4 million a year and straight away put up his rates. This was purely to stir up feeling against the dockers because the firm has been bearing this extra cost for the last nine months and still managed to make a profit without increasing their rates. (The firm have been using Antwerp temporarily, hoping the Tilbury ban would be lifted.)

Anyway, that £4 million a year maximum could easily be swallowed up by the vast profits of the member companies of the OCL combine. These include P & O (last year made a net profit of £9,577,050, the highest for ten years), Ocean Steamship Company (made pre-tax profits of £8,100,000), British and Commonwealth (they expect to make £7,500,000 this year) and Furness Withy (they expect to make £6,500,000).

These figures were not mentioned in the press—only the offer which the dockers rejected of £33 10s. for a 31¼-hour week for fit men and £25 a week for unfit men in exchange for mobility of labour and shiftwork.

Although the dockers' side of the case was given by local journalists to the national papers, none of them were used (except by the *Morning Star*). Great space was given to Sir Andrew Crichton's comments, however.

The *Daily Telegraph* gave a grossly inaccurate report of the Tilbury dockers' meeting, saying Harry Battie (a docker on the committee that imposed the ban) 'with tears streaming down his face pleaded with the mass meeting of Tilbury's 2,000 dockers to all normal working. He told them "you will turn Tilbury into a fishing village if you continue the ban" '.

Although Harry elsewhere stated he was against the ban, he certainly did not plead with the men to lift it but told them it was entirely up to them to decide. Tears were never streaming down his face and the remark about a fishing village was made by another docker to a reporter in a pub.

It was questionable whether the meeting should have been held anyway constitutionally, for the decision of the union's Docks Group Committee was (by 6-5) that the ban stays. If the Tilbury men had voted to work the containers, it would have been in complete defiance of official union policy.

Yet officials of the union were on the platform telling the men they lose their livelihood if they did not operate the containers.

And when General Secretary of the union, Jack Jones, was told of the meeting's outcome he said: 'Naturally I regret this decision.' How can he possibly regret a decision to follow official union policy? This was one case where the press, TV and even union officials are condemning workers for NOT taking unconstitutional action which shows where their true colours fly —the smooth running of capitalism to make large profits for the employers.

'PORTWORKER.'

Contact Column

This column exists for mutual aid. Donations towards cost of typesetting will be welcome.

Agitprop Information, 160 North Gower Street, London, N.W.1. Tel. 01-387 5406. Information and Communication for the Left: Contacts—Diary—Skills—Red Notes—International—Media. Send SAE for literature list and Brochure.

Floodgates of Anarchy by Stuart Christie and Albert Meltzer. Available mid-January at 22/- inc. post. Advance orders to Freedom Bookshop.

Off-Centre Discussion Group. Thursday 8 p.m., Flat 10, Chessington Loope, 8 p.m., Flat 10, Chessington Lodge, Regents Park Road, N.3.

'Computers for communication not control'. Real Time. Sub. 9/- six issues. 66 Hargrave Park, London, N.19. 01-272 0093.

Nova Scotia. Comrades please contact Pete Ridley, c/o Newport Post Office.

Anarchistic films wanted. Please contact Ulf Arnström, Pedagoggränd 9B–104 902 54 Umea, Sweden.

Vietnam War. Statistics and information wanted on medical aspects by stu-

Fr

For W

DECEMBER 6

GOVE

WAG

THE GOVERNM for the next yea rein on wages. Thei will provide for i 2½ and 4½%, but wi lower-paid public genuine productivit these norms, the G have powers, under and Incomes Act, to for up to four mon and Incomes Board

This document, Castle's Department Productivity, also the amalgamation Monopolies Commi will be named t Industry and Manp

At present the draft form, but is sented at Parliame Already the tight criticised by the organisation, while Congress are annoye sultation and the The reason given f that the Governm economy can now gent controls' remo tion of our guard

The DEP lists the stances' which will in under its guard increased producti where wage structu low pay and to a market forces are public sector. This again that the orig Prices and Incomes and has completely lower paid. The G argument to give other workers were

attack on the dockers. Naively, it asks, 'Do the dockers really want to strangle the Port of London and, with it, their own jobs, their own pay packets and their own future?'

Had the writer of this rubbish

natives given to them by the employers was work with a tenth of the conventional manning or not at all. To accept such a drastic cut in manning is hardly tactical, it's just plain suicide.

Sir Andrew Crichton (Chairman of OCL) said the move would cost them up to an extra £4 million a year and straight away put up his rates. This was purely to stir up feeling against the dockers because the firm has been bearing this extra cost for the last nine months and still managed to make a profit without increasing their rates. (The firm have been using Antwerp temporarily, hoping the Tilbury ban would be lifted.)

Anyway, that £4 million a year maximum could easily be swallowed up by the vast profits of the member companies of the OCL combine. These include P & O (last year made a net profit of £9,577,050, the highest for ten years), Ocean Steamship Company (made pre-tax profits of £8,100,000), British and Commonwealth (they expect to make £7,500,000 this year) and Furness Withy (they expect to make £6,500,000).

These figures were not mentioned in the press—only the offer which the dockers rejected of £33 10s. for a 31¼-hour week for fit men and

Although Harry elsewhere stated he was against the ban, he certainly did not plead with the men to lift it but told them it was entirely up to them to decide. Tears were never streaming down his face and the remark about a fishing village was made by another docker to a reporter in a pub.

It was questionable whether the meeting should have been held anyway constitutionally, for the decision of the union's Docks Group Committee was (by 6-5) that the ban stays. If the Tilbury men had voted to work the containers, it would have been in complete defiance of official union policy.

Yet officials of the union were on the platform telling the men they lose their livelihood if they did not operate the containers.

And when General Secretary of the union, Jack Jones, was told of the meeting's outcome he said: 'Naturally I regret this decision.' How can he possibly regret a decision to follow official union policy? This was one case where the press, TV and even union officials are condemning workers for NOT taking unconstitutional action which shows where their true colours fly —the smooth running of capitalism to make large profits for the employers.

'PORTWORKER.'

Contact Column

This column exists for mutual aid. Donations towards cost of typesetting will be welcome.

Agitprop Information, 160 North Gower Street, London, N.W.1. Tel. 01-387 5406. Information and Communication for the Left: Contacts—Diary—Skills—Red Notes—International—Media. Send SAE for literature list and Brochure.

Floodgates of Anarchy by Stuart Christie and Albert Meltzer. Available mid-January at 22/- inc. post. Advance orders to Freedom Bookshop.

Off-Centre Discussion Group. Thursday 8 p.m., Flat 10, Chessington Loope, 8 p.m., Flat 10, Chessington Lodge, Regents Park Road, N.3.

'Computers for communication not control'. Real Time. Sub. 9/- six issues. 66 Hargrave Park, London, N.19. 01-272 0093.

Nova Scotia. Comrades please contact Pete Ridley, c/o Newport Post Office.

Anarchistic films wanted. Please contact Ulf Arnström, Pedagoggränd 9B–104 902 54 Umea, Sweden.

Vietnam War. Statistics and information wanted on medical aspects by students and faculty of University of Nebraska. Write: Jim Hartford, 3326 Harney Street, Omaha, Nebraska 68131, USA.

Speaking From Experience: Libertarian teachers discuss problems of freedom and control. L.T.A. 7 p.m. Saturday, December 13 at Jacquetta Benjamins, 4 Warminster Road, S.E.25.

Open Meeting Seminar on Ireland. Sunday, December 7, 2 o'clock. All welcome at Freedom Press Hall.

Cardiff Peoples Paper. 6d. per issue. 16 Gordon Road, Cardiff, CF1 4PL.

Prisoners for Peace Day. List available from Freedom Press. Send greeting cards of support and solidarity.

Poster Workshop Calendar. Out Now. One Fighting Poster for each month, in black, red and blue. 7/6 each, at least. Send to Alison Waghorne, 9 Lyme Terrace, N.W.1.

Urgent. Help fold and dispatch FREEDOM every Thursday from 4 p.m. onwards. Tea served.

Workers' Mutual Aid pamphlet 1/- each from Freedom Press.

Visits Please! Three of five squatters remanded in custody do not have family in London, and would welcome visits. Brixton: Diarmuid Breatnach ('Buzz'); Ashford Remand Centre, Middx.: David Griffiths, Michael Ali. For rota please phone Sonia Markham at RENown 2014. (Letters also welcomed.)

Bit inf. service 01-229 8219. Urgently requires more crash pads in and around London.

Schools Anarchist Group in Gloucestershire? Contact Kate & Joe, 3 Withy Lea, Leonard Stanly, nr. Stonehouse, GL10 3NS, Glos.

If you wish to make contact let us know.

PLEASE, TEACHER!

THERE IS NO ARGUMENT that can be substantiated against the teachers' demand for extra pay. Purely on the basis of having to live in present-day society (as other low-paid workers), their earnings are below the norm necessary to maintain a reasonable standard of living. Included in the standard of living is the mundane question of being able to afford to buy one's house because of the acute shortage of rentable houses.

Having said that, the inevitable question is then raised, 'Where is the money to come from?' We are told that the amount spent on education at the present time is extremely high and, adding this to the present cost of the social services, the country cannot afford an increase.

To use the classical economists own terms of reference, 'It is a question of priorities'. One would assume that education is a priority but as has been proven so many times governments do not accept this fact. Education receives the first cuts in any national economic crisis, particularly in the case of infants and junior schools. It is true to say that both governments and industry have expressed concern at the comparative lack of facilities in technical education, i.e. education for the very materialist society. In other words, the 'rat race' must not only continue but be intensified.

Looking at the question of teachers' pay in purely materialistic terms, if one agrees they are providing a service, then one is eligible to ask, 'What kind?' In an industrial context it was heartening to see teachers expressing their solidarity in strike action for their just demands—one would welcome a similar course of action on the problem of how and what they have to teach.

Teachers who query the very epitome of their profession appear to be in a very small minority, the rest are content to struggle to turn out first-class automatons and to let the 'comparative below par' drift along until they reach the age eligible for unskilled and semi-skilled industrial fodder.

The responsibility of teachers in present-day society is tremendous, they are responsible for the future generation. It is in their hands whether present-day values, morality and priorities are passed on.

Education has always been a subtle form of brainwashing, necessary to maintain and continue the present form of society. Competition in place of co-operation. Therefore whilst the teachers are fighting for their increase in pay, their real battle is for the freedom of their profession.

BILL CHRISTOPHER.

Give a Subscription for Freedom for the Feast of Saturnalia

Printed by Express Printers, London, E.1

Published by Freedom Press, London, E.1

will provide for
2½ and 4½%, but w
lower-paid public
genuine productivit
these norms, the
have powers, under
and Incomes Act, t
for up to four mo
and Incomes Board
This document,
Castle's Departmen
Productivity, also
the amalgamation
Monopolies Comm
will be named t
Industry and Manp
At present the
draft form, but is
sented at Parliame
Already the tight
criticised by the
organisation, while
Congress are annoy
sultation and the
The reason given
that the Governm
economy can now
gent controls' remo
tion of our guard
The DEP lists th
stances' which will
in under its guard.
increased producti
where wage struct
low pay and to a
market forces are
public sector. This
again that the orig
Prices and Income
and has completel
lower paid. The
argument to give
other workers were
paid brothers. Ma
idea, but the recer
awards to the lowe
this myth. Decent
never gained wit
threat of it.

WORKED FOR T

On the whole,

Double Jeopar

DOUBLE jeopar
logical conclu
Royal Hospital. A
was taken to cour
by the hospital for
The woman ha
orderly for 8½
princely sum of £
week.
The alleged thef
a sliver of chicken
and some mashe
worth 10d.' (*The*
case was in fact di
Five days after t
ing letter appeare
consider public fun
by employing "the
against a lady of
of impeccable cha
nately took away
overs by patients,
some pig of its few
Surely the loss o
adequate punishme
Insanity seems
disease.

bury

he would surely
ters are the last
to strangle their
y packets. That
they refused to
ch needs only ten
sting labour force
s guaranteed a
not just one in

anti-working-class
Mirror makes one
this—'Everybody
dockers' fears
and determina-
ecurity but surely
nd more rational
customers away
ustry.' The point
here are no more
the only alter-
them by the
rk with a tenth
manning or not
uch a drastic cut
rdly tactical, it's

chton (Chairman
move would cost
tra £4 million a
away put up his
purely to stir up
dockers because
bearing this extra
nine months and
ake a profit with-
rates. (The firm
Antwerp tempor-
Tilbury ban would

4 million a year
sily be swallowed
fits of the member
OCL combine.
& O (last year
it of £9,577,050,
en years), Ocean
ny (made pre-tax
000), British and
they expect to
his year) and Fur-
expect to make

ere not mentioned
the offer which
ed of £33 10s. for
for fit men and

£25 a week for unfit men in exchange for mobility of labour and shiftwork.

Although the dockers' side of the case was given by local journalists to the national papers, none of them were used (except by the *Morning Star*). Great space was given to Sir Andrew Crichton's comments, however.

The *Daily Telegraph* gave a grossly inaccurate report of the Tilbury dockers' meeting, saying Harry Battie (a docker on the committee that imposed the ban) 'with tears streaming down his face pleaded with the mass meeting of Tilbury's 2,000 dockers to all normal working. He told them "you will turn Tilbury into a fishing village if you continue the ban" '.

Although Harry elsewhere stated he was against the ban, he certainly did not plead with the men to lift it but told them it was entirely up to them to decide. Tears were never streaming down his face and the remark about a fishing village was made by another docker to a reporter in a pub.

It was questionable whether the meeting should have been held anyway constitutionally, for the decision of the union's Docks Group Committee was (by 6-5) that the ban stays. If the Tilbury men had voted to work the containers, it would have been in complete defiance of official union policy.

Yet officials of the union were on the platform telling the men they lose their livelihood if they did not operate the containers.

And when General Secretary of the union, Jack Jones, was told of the meeting's outcome he said: 'Naturally I regret this decision.' How can he possibly regret a decision to follow official union policy? This was one case where the press, TV and even union officials are condemning workers for NOT taking unconstitutional action which shows where their true colours fly —the smooth running of capitalism to make large profits for the employers.

'PORTWORKER.'

Freedom

For Workers' Control

DECEMBER 6 1969 Vol 30 No 38

GOVERNMENT WAGE NORMS

THE GOVERNMENT still has plans for the next year for keeping a tight rein on wages. Their new incomes policy will provide for increases of between 2½ and 4½%, but will allow more for the lower-paid public employees and for genuine productivity deals. Along with these norms, the Government will also have powers, under Part 2 of the Prices and Incomes Act, to stop wage increases for up to four months, while the Prices and Incomes Board studies them.

This document, drawn up by Mrs. Castle's Department of Employment and Productivity, also announces that with the amalgamation of the PIB and the Monopolies Commission, the new body will be named the Commission for Industry and Manpower.

At present the document is still in draft form, but is expected to be presented at Parliament before Christmas. Already the tight schedule has been criticised by the employers' national organisation, while the Trade Union Congress are annoyed at the lack of consultation and the inclusion of norms. The reason given for their inclusion is that the Government thinks that the economy can now have the 'more stringent controls' removed, but that 'relaxation of our guard would be foolish'.

The DEP lists the 'exceptional circumstances' which will be allowed to sneak in under its guard. They are deals giving increased productivity and efficiency, where wage structures are reorganised, low pay and to aid equal pay, where market forces are strong and in the public sector. This of course shows once again that the original intention of the Prices and Incomes policy was a fraud and has completely failed to help the lower paid. The Government used this argument to give the impression that comes policy has worked, that is for the employers. Profits have been rising, so much in fact that the Government see fit to lift the restrictions on dividends, and the economy is expanding. The economic pundits forecast a healthy balance of payments next year, which could help pave the way into the Common Market.

To anarchists there seemed little doubt that having once interfered with collective bargaining, the Government would not let go very easily and having once entered the arena, the State is reluctant to leave. The ever-growing power of political bureaucracy tries to instruct, supervise and, if necessary, to coerce any who resist or rebel against its authority. The State regulates the lives of the majority of people in the interest of a small minority. The controls and restrictions on workers being able to sell their labour benefits the minority who own and control the productive capacity of this country.

It is not just the Wilson Government, but all governments who do this in the interest of the controllers of industrial power, for this power exceeds national frontiers and the British or American car manufacturers, who have plants in Holland, France or Belgium, also benefit from the income restraints of the governments there.

POWER AND PROFIT

In many cases the economic power is also the political power and in a number of industrialised countries the State is the biggest employer of labour. Such a boss is powerful and totalitarian. The ever-growing monopoly in the so-called private sector is also totalitarian in outlook. They both go hand in hand, each gaining more and more control of pro-

them by the
ork with a tenth
l manning or not
such a drastic cut
rdly tactical, it's

ichton (Chairman
move would cost
xtra £4 million a
away put up his
purely to stir up
dockers because
bearing this extra
nine months and
ake a profit with-
r rates. (The firm
Antwerp tempor-
Tilbury ban would

£4 million a year
asily be swallowed
fits of the member
OCL combine.
& O (last year
fit of £9,577,050,
en years), Ocean
ny (made pre-tax
,000), British and
(they expect to
his year) and Fur-
expect to make

ere not mentioned
y the offer which
ed of £33 10s. for
for fit men and

Although Harry elsewhere stated he was against the ban, he certainly did not plead with the men to lift it but told them it was entirely up to them to decide. Tears were never streaming down his face and the remark about a fishing village was made by another docker to a reporter in a pub.

It was questionable whether the meeting should have been held anyway constitutionally, for the decision of the union's Docks Group Committee was (by 6-5) that the ban stays. If the Tilbury men had voted to work the containers, it would have been in complete defiance of official union policy.

Yet officials of the union were on the platform telling the men they lose their livelihood if they did not operate the containers.

And when General Secretary of the union, Jack Jones, was told of the meeting's outcome he said: 'Naturally I regret this decision.' How can he possibly regret a decision to follow official union policy? This was one case where the press, TV and even union officials are condemning workers for NOT taking unconstitutional action which shows where their true colours fly —the smooth running of capitalism to make large profits for the employers.

'PORTWORKER.'

E, TEACHER!

RGUMENT that can
l against the teachers'
pay. Purely on the
live in present-day
v-paid workers), their
he norm necessary to
le standard of living.
dard of living is the
being able to afford
because of the acute
e houses.
the inevitable ques-
'Where is the money
Ve are told that the
ucation at the present
igh and, adding this
of the social services,
afford an increase.
ical economists own
'It is a question of
uld assume that edu-
ty but as has been
mes governments do
. Education receives
y national economic
n the case of infants
It is true to say that
nd industry have ex-
the comparative lack
hnical education, i.e.
ry materialist society.
e 'rat race' must not
e intensified.
question of teachers'
rialistic terms, if one
viding a service, then
sk, 'What kind?' In
t it was heartening to see teachers expressing their solidarity in strike action for their just demands—one would welcome a similar course of action on the problem of how and what they have to teach.

Teachers who query the very epitome of their profession appear to be in a very small minority, the rest are content to struggle to turn out first-class automatons and to let the 'comparative below par' drift along until they reach the age eligible for unskilled and semi-skilled industrial fodder.

The responsibility of teachers in present-day society is tremendous, they are responsible for the future generation. It is in their hands whether present-day values, morality and priorities are passed on.

Education has always been a subtle form of brainwashing, necessary to maintain and continue the present form of society. Competition in place of co-operation. Therefore whilst the teachers are fighting for their increase in pay, their real battle is for the freedom of their profession.

BILL CHRISTOPHER.

Give a Subscription for Freedom for the Feast of Saturnalia

Printers, London, E.1

Published by Freedom Press, London, E.1

will provide for increases of between 2½ and 4½%, but will allow more for the lower-paid public employees and for genuine productivity deals. Along with these norms, the Government will also have powers, under Part 2 of the Prices and Incomes Act, to stop wage increases for up to four months, while the Prices and Incomes Board studies them.

This document, drawn up by Mrs. Castle's Department of Employment and Productivity, also announces that with the amalgamation of the PIB and the Monopolies Commission, the new body will be named the Commission for Industry and Manpower.

At present the document is still in draft form, but is expected to be presented at Parliament before Christmas. Already the tight schedule has been criticised by the employers' national organisation, while the Trade Union Congress are annoyed at the lack of consultation and the inclusion of norms. The reason given for their inclusion is that the Government thinks that the economy can now have the 'more stringent controls' removed, but that 'relaxation of our guard would be foolish'.

The DEP lists the 'exceptional circumstances' which will be allowed to sneak in under its guard. They are deals giving increased productivity and efficiency, where wage structures are reorganised, low pay and to aid equal pay, where market forces are strong and in the public sector. This of course shows once again that the original intention of the Prices and Incomes policy was a fraud and has completely failed to help the lower paid. The Government used this argument to give the impression that other workers were helping their lower paid brothers. Many were sold on this idea, but the recent explosion of wage awards to the lower paid has destroyed this myth. Decent wage increases are never gained without action or the threat of it.

WORKED FOR THE EMPLOYERS

On the whole, the Government's in-

Double Jeopardy Again

DOUBLE jeopardy is taken to its logical conclusion by Sheffield's Royal Hospital. A 63-year-old woman was taken to court and given the sack by the hospital for alleged theft.

The woman had been a part-time orderly for 8½ years, receiving the princely sum of £6 8s. for a 27-hour week.

The alleged theft consisted of 'bread, a sliver of chicken, a morsel of cheese and some mashed potato, altogether worth 10d.' (*The Star*, Sheffield). The case was in fact dismissed.

Five days after the report the following letter appeared in *The Star*:—'I consider public funds have been misused by employing "the weight of the law" against a lady of 63, reported as being of impeccable character, who unfortunately took away scraps of food, left-overs by patients, and thereby deprived some pig of its few pennyworth!

Surely the loss of her occupation was adequate punishment!'

Insanity seems to be a contagious disease.

D.J.

fit to lift the restrictions on dividends, and the economy is expanding. The economic pundits forecast a healthy balance of payments next year, which could help pave the way into the Common Market.

To anarchists there seemed little doubt that having once interfered with collective bargaining, the Government would not let go very easily and having once entered the arena, the State is reluctant to leave. The ever-growing power of political bureaucracy tries to instruct, supervise and, if necessary, to coerce any who resist or rebel against its authority. The State regulates the lives of the majority of people in the interest of a small minority. The controls and restrictions on workers being able to sell their labour benefits the minority who own and control the productive capacity of this country.

It is not just the Wilson Government, but all governments who do this in the interest of the controllers of industrial power, for this power exceeds national frontiers and the British or American car manufacturers, who have plants in Holland, France or Belgium, also benefit from the income restraints of the governments there.

POWER AND PROFIT

In many cases the economic power is also the political power and in a number of industrialised countries the State is the biggest employer of labour. Such a boss is powerful and totalitarian. The ever-growing monopoly in the so-called private sector is also totalitarian in outlook. They both go hand in hand, each gaining more and more control of production, which is concentrated into fewer hands. The social objectives of production have long since been lost in the grab for power and profit. Instead of satisfying people's needs, the growing of food, the provision of shelter and the manufacturing of goods are created to provide this power and profit for the few.

The State will continue to expand its power to ensure the survival of the profit motive, and to ensure a reversal of this trend and encroachment, it is necessary to attack not only the wage restraint but all other forms of State interference. The State serves and defends the interest of the minority who own and control the productive wealth. In order to gain control of this, the people must also abolish that defender and take over and run things for themselves.

P.T.

HELL IS A CITY

Continued from page 1

not provide the slaughter and maiming that takes place on London roads daily, the chaos that is London Transport in the rush hour, or generate the ill-will that is current among road-users on a heavy day.

But what is the anarchist answer? There is no anarchist answer to non-anarchist questions. Such as how, whilst retaining the private car, the profit system, the centralized power-structure of London, can we make London (or any city) fit to live in? To this question there is no answer.

A fundamental reconstruction of ideas starting perhaps with communally-used motor cars, free transport, and a decentralised community would move us towards an answer to the question; but by then London would no longer be London.

JACK ROBINSON.